THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
1800

WHAT TOLSTOY TAUGHT

What Tolstoy Taught

EDITED BY

BOLTON HALL

AUTHOR OF

"THREE ACRES AND LIBERTY," ETC.

NEW YORK

B. W. HUEBSCH

1911

Copyright 1911, by
B. W. HUEBSCH

BJ1528
.R8T62

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

$1.50

©Cl.A303665

INTRODUCTION

ANYONE may reject Count Tolstoy's teaching: no one can ignore it; his doctrine is dynamic, revolutionary, fatal if false, a message of peace if true. It has made a profound impression upon the world, and it would therefore behoove us at least to know exactly what that doctrine is. It is strange that, notwithstanding his great popularity and great influence upon thought and feeling, indirect as well as direct, there is no book written by which we can show plain people just what he does teach. I have long been a student of Tolstoy, but only in writing this book did I see, myself, all that Tolstoy taught.

Most persons want to get a clear impression of the matured views of the Prophets, not of how they developed, changed and were often recanted. Many of the apparent contradictions that confuse us in the doctrines of the great are simply questions of time, and are due to expression of opinions afterwards changed, under the influence of the changing experiences of their authors. Tolstoy wrote to Rahmánoff in 1891: "Do not imagine that I defend the point of view I formerly ex-

pressed in *What do I Believe?"* (published in 1884) referring, apparently, to his remark that "it is impossible to love one's enemies." "I not only do not defend it, but am glad to have outlived it." He rewrote all his books, revising and changing again and again.

There are several lives of Tolstoy, among the best of which are Birukof's, a very extensive work, and Aylmer Maude's *Life* in two thick volumes.

Maude's account of Tolstoy's doctrine is excellent and shows its progressive character, but it is voluminous. The book is rather costly and is somewhat marred, as it seems to me, by Maude's own intelligent, but conventional and equally voluminous criticisms of Tolstoy's thought.

Some others of these "Lives" contain short reviews of his doctrine; but most persons, however well educated, can gather from them but the vaguest notions of what he did say and of why he lived as he did. Consequently he is regarded by many, just as Jesus is, as an amiable idealist, wholly illogical and impracticable, who preached a gospel that no one can follow. Readers think that he was an original but eccentric and inconsistent teacher. As Tolstoy points out, the learned Jews, who were the contemporaries of Jesus, had a very similar idea of his teachings. Tolstoy and Jesus are regarded as impractical for the same

reason; that each states the same doctrine, which men do not wish to practice and have therefore misinterpreted and perverted.

Tolstoy says that the precepts of Jesus have been misconstrued by us because we do not wish to understand them.—(*M. R.*, 147.) He says, "If however we take the words of Jesus as we would take the words of anyone who speaks to us and admit that he says exactly what he does say, all these profound circumlocutions vanish away."

It would be unfortunate if Tolstoy's own writings met the same difficulty notwithstanding his plain writing and tediously careful repetitions. Therefore, I have taken Tolstoy's very words, "as we would take the words of anyone who speaks to us," in order to set forth his doctrine truly.

This doctrine is in short that for a man always to substitute love for all compulsion would solve his harassing perplexities and abolish for him the horrors and the unreasonable complexities of life.

Tolstoy approved of my account of his book *On Life* as originally published, and, since his voice is stilled, I have added from his other writings only his own words to amplify and complete that Summary of his Message.

I believe that this volume contains the substance of everything that Tolstoy taught. I have not

attempted to give the lessons of his works of fiction, because those are of the nature of parables, and from a parable each person learns only what he is ready to receive. Accordingly, comments on those could be only interpretations, not expositions. Tolstoy's fiction but popularizes or illustrates the doctrine of what he regarded as his only important works, but which, in comparison to his wonderful fiction, are hardly read at all.

The late Ernest Crosby first directed me to Tolstoy's book *On Life,* saying that much as he admired it, he had ceased to call general attention to it, because he found that people would not and could not read it; and even the French version wearied those who might be expected to enjoy the elegant French for its own sake.

It is not wonderful then that there is so little clear understanding of Tolstoy because, unlike his novels, all his religious books are, I regret to say, quite unreadable. The style is involved, the matter is lacking in order, filled with tedious repetition and written for those only who want to understand; but when the ideas are combed out of his tangle of words, they prove to be sharp-cut and to fit one another.

The extracts from *My Confession, My Religion,* and *What To Do* (all of which are so marked), read by themselves, form good abstracts

of those books, and, read in connection with the summary of his philosophy, give a clear view of his whole religious teaching.

The book *What is Art?*, a most entertaining work, not only expresses his views on this vexed question, but helps to clear the atmosphere for any who earnestly seek to answer that question in its relation to real life.

One of the most significant and revolutionary of Tolstoy's reforms consisted in the school he conducted for the children on his estate. It was on the model of our present Ferrer Schools: in it he worked out many of the problems of his own relation to life that had not been clear to him before. The quotations given here convey Tolstoy's general idea of education.

What to Do, written in 1882, is the practical summing up of Tolstoy's teaching, the summing up of what set him to make shoes and to produce with his hands, not in order to earn his own living, which Tolstoy never pretended to do, but to produce at least so much of what people need as would convince him that "I give people more than I take from them . . . and . . . that their account with me does not land them in a loss." He worked because he felt that it is not enough to feel love or to teach love by lip words.

As he himself expressed it: "It is not enough

to tend a man, to feed and teach him Greek; we must teach the man how to live,— that is, to take as little as possible from others, and to give as much as possible; and we cannot help teaching him to do the contrary, if we take him into our houses, or into an institution founded for this purpose."— (*W. D.*, 70.) We must express genuine love by "getting off the backs of the poor" (*M. L.*, 476), by becoming producers instead of parasites.

In reading Tolstoy's sweeping assertions we must remember, I think, that in order to force a new doctrine into public attention it is necessary, as Garrison knew, for a preacher of it to state it broadly and without qualification. This was the method of Jesus also: for example, it cannot be that all those Scribes and Pharisees were nothing but "hypocrites." To straighten a steel bar, we must bend it in the opposite direction.

Had Garrison said merely that Slavery was an outgrown institution that ought to be thrown off; or had the early Temperance reformers said only that liquor drinking was a needless and injurious habit, people would have said, "Yes, that is probably true; we must modify these things and eventually get rid of them," and would have gone on to talk to the reformers about the weather. But when Garrison said that the Constitution that sanc-

tioned Slavery was " a covenant with death and an agreement with hell," and the Prohibitionists told us about " the Demon Rum " they got attention and consideration.

It is necessary, it seems to me, to state a great truth in large and emphatic terms if it is to be heard at all. This Tolstoy did whether he spoke of Religion, Teaching, Literature, Art, Government or Land-owning. He admitted, says Maude, that " sometimes he strained the meaning in a contrary direction. He compares his task to that of a man who has to demagnetize a steel bar by exposing it to an opposite influence."—(*M. L.*, 53).

Truth may need to be overstated, but plenty of persons who believe in overstatement, will be found to overstate it. Maybe to do so is the office of the prophet — but that is no reason why we who see the true proportion of things, should exaggerate, much less a reason why we should reject all the statements of the prophet. If then we find in Tolstoy ideas that seem to us unreasonable, why so we did in all the Prophets. But if they really are unreasonable, we need not eat the pit with the peach.

I think that Tolstoy, like Henry George and many another Master, did not realize the far-reaching conclusion to be deduced from his own

premises. Tolstoy teaches the Oneness of Men, but seems often to overlook the fact that this Oneness makes it impossible for any man to do right by himself. Each must, however unwillingly, take some part in the "sins" of all the rest.

For example, D. Merejkowsky, a Russian biographer (in his *Tolstoy as Man and Artist*), finds much fault with Tolstoy himself because he appears inconsistent in that he "ceased to make use of his property" "except for the fact that he remained under the roof of Yasnaia."

Why should he do otherwise? To live in a hut next door to his family, and to prepare his separate food, would have been only to add an additional expense to the family budget. To separate himself entirely from his family would have been merely to sacrifice more of his own time and of theirs in getting the necessary living and to establish a still less normal life at the cost of much pain to them and to him. He did all that he could by insisting on actually producing, by such means as seemed most natural, as much as he consumed.

Nor was it possible for him, any more than for the rest of us, to make a right disposition of his land or of the revenues from it. To give it to the State under present conditions would be merely to add to the wealth and power of an Institution of which he did not approve, and to induce new State

extravagance, or to lighten the burden of those who support that Institution.

To present the land to the tenants would be merely to create numerous small landlords, who would be more effective in sanctioning landlordism than one big landlord. This is what the English Tories have striven to do for Ireland by government Land Purchase, and the Allotment Acts.

Under present conditions everyone must be either a nomad, a tenant, or a land owner: there is no escape. The tenant is as much a sustainer of the land system as the land owner: for if no one would pay rent, if men could find a way to live without paying rent directly or indirectly to private persons, it would be as fatal to the land system as if no one would collect rent.

Tolstoy, like Thoreau, made the best attempt he could to live according to his ideals, and no one can read *What To Do* without seeing how sadly unsatisfactory the result was to him and even to those who most sympathize with him and admire him and his ardor and sincerity.

But these are only my own opinions. This book gives Tolstoy's opinions, and his reasons for them, in his own words.

The Count wrote to me the following endorsement of a draft of the first part of this book *On Life:*

Dear Sir:

I have received your book and have read it. I think it is very good and renders in a concise form quite truly the chief ideas of my book; I hope that this book in this new form will be useful in the sense in which I intended it to be to a larger public than the original.

With my best thanks and wishes for the success of your book, I am, dear sir,

Yours truly,

(Signed) LEO TOLSTOY.

21st March, 1897.

No idea has been added to the text or modified since that letter was written. The ideas have only been elaborated in order that they may be plain and clear; that they are rightly elaborated is clear from their agreement with the extracts from Tolstoy's other books, which, arranged, as far as may be, in logical order, form the second part of this volume.

Lest the reader should suspect that I have perhaps softened Tolstoy's dogmatic and unqualified assertions, or arranged his words so as to convey my own thought, I should say that there is much in Tolstoy's writings that I cannot agree with. I recognize that it may well be that he sees much deeper than I. Those who care for my own views will find them in my *Life and Love and Peace,* for the basis of most of which I am indebted to this great Teacher.

It may be that it is given to me to help to carry on Tolstoy's great work, in some measure to extend the influence of his writings and of his life, and so to help to balance the account with his fellow-men that he thought, even up to his death, to be so sorely against him.

BOLTON HALL.

CONTENTS

PART I

ON LIFE

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	The Separate Life	23
II	Delusions about Life	29
III	Attempts to Explain Life	36
IV	The Search for Truth	43
V	The True Law of Life	48
VI	The Good of Life	54
VII	The Life Universal	62
VIII	Desire	69
IX	Unity of Our Lives	75
X	The Dual Nature	81
XI	The Selfish Love	87
XII	Animal Love	93
XIII	Real Love	98
XIV	Love's Sacrifice	104
XV	Life is Love	109
XVI	The Pursuit of Happiness	115
XVII	The Fear of Death	120
XVIII	Life Everlasting	126
XIX	The Terror from Ignorance	133
XX	Spiritual Life	138

CHAPTER PAGE

XXI The Real Life 143
XXII The Use of Pain 149
XXIII The Balm for Suffering . . . 155

PART II

ON ACTION

I Problems 163
II Religion 171
III The Church 180
IV The School 184
V Art 192
VI Science 205
VII What, then, Must We Do? . . . 213
VIII Women and Men 222
IX Alcohol and Tobacco 231
X Government 235
XI A Great Iniquity 241
XII Human Rights 269

Index 277

REFERENCES

THE following abbreviations are used in citations of Tolstoy's works so as not unnecessarily to break the connection of the text:

C. R.— *Cycle of Readings.* (Dana Estes & Co.)

M. L.— *Life of Tolstoy.* (When not marked V. I, citations are from Vol. II) by Aylmer Maude. (Dodd Mead & Co., 1910.)

M. R.— *My Religion.* (Crowell & Co., 1899.) Some editions are entitled, *What I Believe.* Although citing from the later edition, I have often used clearer phraseology from Huntington Smith's translation from the French ed. of 1885, or from others.

M. C.— *My Confession.* (Crowell, 1887.)

S. C. T.— *Spirit of Christ's Teachings.* (Dana Estes & Co.) Some editions are entitled, *Summary of Christ's Teachings.*

T. S. M.— *Tolstoy as a Schoolmaster.* By Ernest Crosby. (A. C. Fifield, London.)

E. S.— *Tolstoy on Shakespeare.* (Funk & Wagnalls.) Also entitled, *Essay on Shakespeare.*

W. A.— *What is Art?* (Crowell, 1899.)

W. D.— *What to Do.* (Crowell, 1887.) Some editions entitled, *What, Then, Must We Do?*

For other books occasionally cited, the full name is given; also page, except where the book is very small.

PART I

ON LIFE

On Life, carelessly printed in Geneva or copied from the rough manuscript, requires much critical acumen on the part of its readers to grasp its full meaning. . . . We have as yet, I think, no satisfactory translation; but Bolton Hall without knowing Russian, puzzled out the meaning of the book and has written a free paraphrase giving its essence very well."—(*M. L.,* 523.)

CHAPTER I

THE SEPARATE LIFE

LIFE contains the true and the false, and whether it means much to us or little depends upon whether the true seems false to us and the false true, or whether we know things as they are.

You and I live for our own good; that is, we have for our main object in life what we think will benefit us individually. All of us seek the conditions that we think will make us happy, and this we do instinctively. It is impossible for us to imagine life without the desire for happiness. Sometimes the desired benefit is direct, sometimes indirect, but it is for ourselves. You do not live for the sole purpose of securing good for me, nor do I live with no other aim than your good. If we examine our thoughts we find that the desire for personal happiness is the motive of all we do; without this desire there would be nothing in our lives that is there now. Everything we do is done consciously or unconsciously to increase the sum of our happiness.

If we look about us, as well as within, we shall

find that other persons live like ourselves for their own particular good, and seek what they, too, think will bring happiness to themselves. When considering any course of action, they ask themselves the one question —"Will this be good for me?" If they see the thing clearly as good for them, their decision is quickly made.

Their idea of good for them is simply the gratification of their own desires, no matter what those desires may be. "I want this" seems to them a sufficient reason for taking it, unless the consequences that they can see are disastrous. They cannot conceive of disappointment or hindrance as other than a sorrow, something "bad" for them. So, even though they may see also that their gratification may be bad for you and for me, in that it may prevent us getting what we desire, yet they do not hesitate. They believe that this good of theirs requires the sacrifice of your good and mine.

This is the separate, individual idea of life; the idea that regards each living creature as separate and distinct from every other living creature, and as necessarily antagonistic to others. It is this conception of life that, for the sake of their petty happiness, their own personal good, makes living beings willing to deprive other beings of greater happiness and even of life itself. In consequence of this separate feeling each one is always contend-

ing against hosts of others. We make Ishmaels of ourselves, with our hand against every man, and every man's hand against us.

Under these conditions it is impossible that we should get any other idea of life than that we have individual interests separate from the interests of those about us and conflicting with them. So thoroughly does this idea pervade our beliefs, that we speak of even the devotion of a mother to her child as a "sacrifice" of her interests for those of the child. Yet if we only consider this view we must see how false it is. How could a mother sacrifice her "interests" to those of her child when, if properly understood, they are one and the same? She may be mistaken in what really is the child's interest, and all her devotion may result in injuring it, or at least in delaying its development, but the fact of her unfailing devotion is itself the best proof that she could conceive of no real interests for herself apart from those of her child.

So long as we think the false life is true life, just so long will continue the struggle, to which life is always likened. And at the end of it all we see Death, which we believe to be the loss of consciousness, or at best a change to a spirit life. Our conception of the spirit life is so at variance with what we think of this life, that we cannot reconcile the two, and so this change seems to us a

strange and terrible transformation. To contemplate it deprives us of joy and comfort. Although we feel compelled to continue the struggle, the inevitable end of it all fills us with terror or loathing, which no immediate success can materially mitigate.

For, though we succeed from day to day in the struggle for that which we think good for us, we feel that the good we seek will be incomplete, even if it were to last; we know this from our past experience. Everything that we have secured by struggle has given us less happiness than we had hoped for; indeed, many times it has brought us only pain, and we have regretted our success. Furthermore, if it has fulfilled our desire, even then it has not satisfied us. We have learned that the fulfillment of one desire but creates fresh desires which in their turn clamor for satisfaction; but we also know that the good we seek will not last, that it will be but for a moment in our hands. Whether we are willing to understand or not, life shows us on every plane that "this, too, shall pass away." At the least, the form of the good will change, so that we shall not recognize it.

Holding the false view of life, and feeling only our own desires, we imagine that the personal good, for which we live, and true happiness are one and the same. But we shall find, if we go on, that this is a mistake; we do not secure true happiness

to ourselves even though we are able to grasp all that seems good to us in our struggle with others.

True happiness cannot consist in seeking our own good. Sooner or later we all learn that. When it is first borne in upon us, we try to make a bargain with life. Still having in view our own happiness, we attempt to secure it by efforts to do good to others which we hope to exchange for their efforts to do good to us. But happiness is not to be secured through trading, however unconscious it may be; happiness cannot be won through barter; it is not for sale or exchange in the world's market.

Nor is this selfish attitude really natural; on the contrary, the desire for the happiness of others is natural to the uncorrupted man. He willingly subordinates his personal desires to the good of others, and will sacrifice his separate interests to that unselfish aim as readily and naturally as an animal will sacrifice its life in defense of its young.

All great religious teachers have taught this gospel; we recognize its truth, and are inspired to better things by its ennobling force. Yet in the early movement for a scientific interpretation of life and its phenomena, " scientific " men like Herbert Spencer were led to deny this doctrine, and to assert that the object of life is simply the satisfaction of desires.

But the teachers of creeds and superstitions, while rejecting the materialistic conclusions of science, offered no more satisfying view of life than did the scientists. Their idea of the plan of life made it scarcely worth enduring, because of its failure to secure happiness here. They, however, held out the hope of a satisfactory amendment of this worthless plan, in a life beyond the grave for those who accepted their teachings. They did not see that a life carried out on the same principles as this present life, could not bring happiness, no matter how perfectly operated. Indeed, the more perfect its operation the less probability would there be for true happiness.

CHAPTER II

DELUSIONS ABOUT LIFE

WHAT is life, and what is the good in life that will give us happiness? This is the question that ever presses for an answer, yet remains unanswered. Our days pass but we find no satisfactory answer in ourselves, for our false view of life precludes the possibility of a satisfactory answer. It is as though while seeking to see the delicate flush of early dawn, we sought to enhance our vision by looking through smoked glasses.

The tender, gentle gradations of color would be lost to us, and if we had never looked upon the dawn with clear vision, we would surely say that no delicate colors graced the rising of the sun. So it is with us when we try to discern the meaning of life, and to discover the good it holds. That false view of life which makes us think we have separate interests and desires that must be gratified at any cost obscures our mental and spiritual vision, and prevents us seeing the dawning beauty of life.

Finding no satisfaction within, we think that someone else must know the secret of the good in

life, and so we follow after another, listening with itching ears for what he has to say, and following with blind groping hands the way he treads. And still we find neither happiness nor peace, though ever in quest of them.

The modern God is Science, and when we appeal to it, its interpreters answer that life is the struggle of persons, races, and species for existence, and that the good of life is success in that struggle, "the highest exercise of faculty." These interpreters are the Scribes of modern days, and their answers are not intended to be understood of the people.

The answers are not satisfactory, because they cannot be understood. He who has come to the stage where he asks "What is life and its good?" knows that the scientist has not answered right. It is true that men have so far manifested life through struggle; as individuals, as races, as species, men have contended with each other and he who was strong enough to prevail was he who maintained existence. We know, too, that through that cruel and selfish struggle men have developed qualities that should enable them to make mere existence better and higher from age to age; in this struggle, then, say the Scientists, life consists. But admitting this struggle for existence, the thoughtful man feels that while it may be a stage through which

man must pass, the harassing struggle cannot be its object. He knows there must be a higher exercise of faculty than mere struggle. He finds all nature working in harmony with law. The stars and planets circle in their respective orbits without strife, one against the other. Is man's life less harmonious than theirs? He cannot believe it.

Unsatisfied by the answers of the votaries of material science, men turn to the ecclesiastical teachers in the hope of finding what they seek. These are the Pharisees of to-day, and they answer that happiness or good consists only in the hope of a future life. For, say they, we know there is not, and never can be, good in this life. And having said this, they proceed to prove it by accepting in fact the dictum of the scientist that life here is merely a struggle for existence. They protest against such a view in words, but they accept it in fact, adding only that this struggle is the way by which we shall enter another life which shall gratify all our personal desires. As opposed to the personal life, Jesus taught us, not of a life beyond the grave, but of that universal life which comprises within itself the life of humanity, past, present, and to come.—(*M. R.*, 194.)

The time has already come when it is clear to all who will consider it, that the idea of renouncing this life for the sake of preparing for a life for

one's self beyond, is a delusion. It is so illogical that it cannot be clearly expressed, for even though this life were given us only that we might prepare for another, it would be no less necessary that we should understand this life. On the contrary, it would be even more necessary to understand it, since the only possible purpose for us in a life beyond this would be that we had progressed so far that we needed a larger outlet for the "exercise of faculty."

Renouncing this life with all it may contain will not of itself fit us for a larger life.

What would we think of the man who wished to be an expert mathematician, and, knowing nothing of the possible combinations of figures, yet scorned to study the multiplication table? If he said, "I do not know this, but it cannot mean anything compared with those elaborate operations men perform in 'advanced mathematics,' therefore I will not waste time studying it"— we should call him a fool, and remind him that all knowledge was progressive, and that he must know the fundamentals of mathematics before he could perform abstruse calculations.

So, even if we were sure of a life beyond, as sure as we are that we now have life here, it would still be necessary that we understand this life before we could understand the next. We get to under-

stand anything only by studying the laws that govern it, and conforming our relations toward it to those laws.

To renounce our present life in the hope of gaining more life beyond, without understanding either life, is equally to delude ourselves.

But it is no improvement upon that plan to argue that it is good for us to live for ourselves in the present. To do this is as though one should approach the solution of the control of nature's forces with a cut-and-dried theory of how it was to be done, based upon nothing surer than guess-work. We cannot know what is good for us in our present life, until we have first studied that life, and its relation to the all-life.

Our experience early teaches us that our individual life, used in a selfish way, is evil and senseless. Even the small child learns this much from his relations with his fellows. If he wants the utmost enjoyment from his daily life with his peers, he will not seek only his seeming individual good at the expense of his fellows. Though he be strong enough to enforce his will, and to secure his selfish aims, his success will be robbed of all that would have made it taste good. He is so constituted, being man in embryo, that he cannot fully enjoy success if those about him do not rejoice in it also. The youngest child who has thus

gained his ends has found the fruits of his victory crumble to ashes in his hands.

We, who are merely children of larger growth, soon come to regard a life spent in this way as evil and senseless. There is nothing about it that causes rejoicing either to us or to our friends. We feel that we should use our life for a different purpose.

But it is no more satisfactory to live for one's family, for society, for one's country or even for mankind. We can all recall the "failures" among our friends, who were no greater failures when living for themselves than when living for their families. In the one case they were shutting themselves out from the true understanding of life, and in the other they were cutting off the family from any understanding.

To live for one's country, for society or even for all mankind is but another way of trying to trade off the good we do to others for the good they may do to us. It is the old idea of barter or exchange, a transaction in the market-place, where happiness abides not.

Besides, if living for oneself shows us that the life of the individual is miserable and senseless, it will show the life of any collection of individuals to be no less miserable or senseless. If each component part of any mass is corrupt and bad, we

shall not make a desirable or beautiful thing simply by uniting those component parts in one whole.

If, however, each part has its use, and we understand what that use is, we may by uniting them create a thing of joy and beauty. So it is with the life of the mass. If each life making up the mass is beautiful, and its purpose understood, then will the mass be beautiful. But if we find each individual life senseless and miserable, the mass will be no more worthy of sacrifice than are the individuals which compose it.

CHAPTER III

ATTEMPTS TO EXPLAIN LIFE

We believe that life consists of a desire for happiness for ourselves and for those about us, but at the same time we feel that evil and death will come to all. For centuries men have gone on believing and feeling this, living out their time in the vain attempt to reconcile or to overlook this contradiction. It was the hopelessness of this attempt which led to the theory that in another life beyond this we should find the happiness we miss or seek so unsuccessfully here.

Admitting the proposition that life consisted of desires that could not possibly be gratified, that were in the nature of things foredoomed to disappointment and destruction, a thinking man must reach one of two conclusions or else sink under his despair.

The more pleasing conclusion was that the fulfillment of desire was not denied, but merely delayed, to be attained in another life. To the teachers of this doctrine men have said, "But how?" and out of this spontaneous question grew

creeds, forms, ceremonies and all the observances of ecclesiasticism. The great mass of men accepted this gladly.

We have learned that, being here, we must live, and, the object of life being happiness, we must live for that. But circumstances make it impossible for us to secure a life of perfect animal happiness. Knowing no other life than this animal life, and appreciating no other, we find ourselves at strife with ourselves; this strife in its essence is interminable and brings us only misery.

We compare our lives with those of the insects and beasts, which, apparently untroubled by speculations as to what their life should be, submit themselves to the law of their being, and live a joyous and tranquil life. We begin to suspect that what we have thought about life and its desires is not right, and again the inner strife rages. We feel we must find a solution of it all, and we grasp eagerly at the hope of another life that will solve all the problems of this. We conclude that the problems will continue, and the conditions be similar; but that through some mysterious change in ourselves, gained only through the death of the body, we shall learn to understand and to reconcile the irreconcilable.

The other possible conclusion is to deny the worth of individual existence. Life is not in-

tended for the individual at all. All his struggle here is not that he may attain happiness now or hereafter, but that he may perpetuate and improve the race, the species. To what end none may say, for no ultimate goal is pictured save the coldly unsatisfying one of improvement of the species. It apparently offers man the opportunity to forget the individual self with its insignificant desires and attainments in the tremendous possibilities and achievements of that aggregate self called the race.

And to some this theory comes as a new gospel which they hear gladly, forgetting that if our individual life be worthless and insignificant, the aggregate of such lives cannot be any more valuable. To multiply zero by millions still gives zero.

Neither of these solutions of man's life satisfies us permanently. When we look about us we find that we are surrounded by conditions and circumstances that make a perfect life an impossibility — that is, the sort of perfect life which unreasoning feeling demands. Few can become so absorbed in a future life, or so satisfied with the improvement of the species, as to cease desiring happiness and peace now.

Seeking two objects when it is possible to attain only one inevitably produces that struggle which is the cause of most of our unhappiness, and creates in thinking minds restlessness in regard to the

mysteries of life. This struggle and its attendant miseries, this restlessness and its unsatisfying speculations pervade the whole of our life here, and are as apparent in our social and industrial relations to our fellow-men as in our own inharmonious individual life. They can be removed only by willingly subjecting ourselves to the law of our higher being.

Our difficulty arises from confusing our animal life with our true life — that is, with the spiritual life. We are conscious of both these existences, but we have not learned to reconcile them. The natural life we know by the feeling that we exist. This is a consciousness of our mere physical being which awakes early even in the helpless, unthinking infant, and remains with us to the end of conscious experience here.

The spiritual life we know by the feeling that we love — a feeling separate from the recognition of mere physical existence. First comes the recognition "I am," the feeling that makes us pursue our selfish personal desires; after that comes the knowledge "I love," the feeling that makes us seek our brother and endeavor to understand him too.

We therefore feel that there are two contradictory natures in us, the one urging us to selfish gratification as the end of life; the other recogniz-

ing the claim of our brothers. Which shall prevail? We know all the time that there can be only one true life, but we cannot decide which it is. The inclination of that which we recognize when we say "I am," is sometimes one way, sometimes another.

This seeming contradiction in ourselves recalls the sensation of one who, crooking two fingers, one over the other, rolls a little ball between them, and *feels* as if there were two balls, but *knows* that there is only one.

The renunciation of personal happiness for life according to the higher nature, is as natural to man as flying is natural to a bird. With all our struggle we do not see this: indeed it is the very dust of the conflict that blinds our eyes to this truth. We conceive of ourselves as beings absorbed in personal aims only, and we think renunciation of self unnatural. But if the bird wills only to run, that does not prove that it is not its nature to fly. So if we see about us men with unawakened minds, men who think their lives consist in securing their own happiness — even though we ourselves may be of that number — it is not thereby proved that there is no higher life.

To seek for our good in gratification of personal desires only is to make ourselves like an animal that might think that its life consists in conform-

ing to the laws of gravity by not moving, although constantly fretted by appetite and by the desire for exercise. But no animal is so stupid as not to conform to the whole law of its being, which necessarily includes movement and rest.

So man is fretted by the desire for the fulfillment of the higher nature when once he has realized it, if he attempts to hold himself to the pursuit of personal happiness. Every man who thinks is subject to this dissatisfaction, and seeks an explanation for it in the thinking. We say "thought is pain"; and almost everyone thinks to himself, "I am a strange mixture."

But even this admission of the fact that he has two natures which seem to be engaged in strife does not aid him in his never-ending search for happiness. The dissatisfaction can only be escaped, the painful search ended, by following one of two courses. We must either live a purely animal existence as embodied in the feeling "I am" and ignore that other feeling "I love," or else we must renounce the selfish aim, and seek only the new and better life.

There is no other alternative, as life shows us both the life we know in ourselves and the life we see manifested in others. To try to live according to both natures is to fail to live in harmony with either, and there is no unhappiness so acute,

so far-reaching as the unhappiness of disharmony. The attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable is fraught with pain and disaster. One of the two natures must be renounced if life is to mean anything truly desirable or harmonious.

CHAPTER IV

THE SEARCH FOR TRUTH

Most men rake in the muck, and some never look up from their muck; they see nothing of the overhead wonders and cannot conceive of them. But if once we see a glimpse of the better life, even though but a reflection of the light shed by those who live the true life, we can never again satisfy ourselves with the worse or lower life.

We understand life so little that we spend our time consciously striving for that which should be attained as unconsciously as is digestion, while the things which we should strive for consciously are either unknown to us or else disregarded by us.

The only guide we have to a true life is the higher reason which the Bible calls Wisdom (*logos*).

Learned men consider the insignificant teachings of Aristotle, Bacon, Comte and a few others true because they are accepted and understood by so few, and because they do not control the masses and are therefore not corrupted by superstition. As though the higher life could be attained only

by a select few! The same learned men regard the teachings of Buddha, of Zoroaster, Lao-tsze, Confucius and Jesus, which in their essence are one, as superstitions, merely because those teachings have appealed to the masses, and have changed millions of lives.

They forget that the unity of these teachings, so widely separated by time and space, is the strongest possible proof of their truth. What is the essence of these teachings presented in varying degrees of perfection? It is that the life is more than flesh — the very sum of all wisdom. It is not that we have a soul in our bodies; but rather that the soul develops its life through our bodies.

That this essential truth finds a response in the hearts of countless millions, to-day and for centuries past, goes to prove the oneness of man's life ever since he became conscious of life itself. That we have progressed no farther than we have is largely due to misdirected study and effort. Having caught this glimpse of truth, man has been compelled to seek it. Reason, the faculty we have called to our aid to discover something which is over and above reason, has been directed toward the study of the origin and history of mankind, and to the circumstances by which mankind is surrounded, in the hope of thereby discovering Truth.

Failing in our progress along this line, we have recently taken to studying the minds of men by the laws of matter, hoping thereby to discover the cause of man's activity.

These studies are interesting and instructive. They reveal to us many things we might not otherwise learn; they may save us from errors and experiments that might imperil our lives, but we cannot find the meaning of life from them. It would be as possible for a tree to learn the theory of collecting and distributing sap for the growth of the leaves and fruit, through study of the physical and chemical changes always taking place in it, as for man to discover the secret of true life through studying his mind by the laws of matter.

All our knowledge of these laws will not afford us guidance in so simple a matter as what to do with the piece of bread in our hands. We shall not learn thereby whether to give the bread to our daughter, to a stranger, to the dog that eyes it hungrily, or to eat it ourselves; nor shall we thus learn whether to defend the bit of bread as our property against all-comers, or to yield it to the first person who demands it of us. The laws of matter do not shape our decision, nor enlighten us how to decide these things. Yet living is entirely made up of such decisions. On these decisions happiness depends.

Things at a distance seem simple because we cannot see the complexity of their details, and such things, therefore, attract our attention, while that which is close at hand appears complex. If we view a mountain from a distance we get no idea of the difficulties of scaling it. To us all the bowlders, chasms and perpendicular rocks are blended into one whole which seems comparatively smooth and easy to climb. It attracts us and makes us feel that it would be a pleasure to scale it, even while we hesitate to attempt the rough sides of a nearby peak of lesser height. We can see the difficulties of the hill near at hand, and we realize that it would be no easy task to reach the summit.

So men think that they understand what happiness is, and what time and matter are, but they do not understand themselves. Accordingly, they ever seek happiness without finding it, and though they investigate and formulate the laws of matter, they do not thereby learn how to live.

In the case of a mere animal, sound reason consists only in care for its physical well-being. The animal is not conscious of any needs or desires beyond the material ones, and in caring for and gratifying those it is fulfilling the law of its being. We understand the life of an animal, because we see in it, as in ourselves, a striving for happiness, and the necessity for it also to submit to reason.

The animal strives for happiness by fulfilling all the requirements of its nature. Its own nature lies nearest to it, and it is through living in accordance with it that the animal is able to fill all the purposes of its life. If man understood himself better, he would know that in a similar course lies happiness for him. For we really know things not in proportion to their simplicity, but in proportion to their nearness of association with us.

Now the true life of man, the better part, which all may choose, is found in that which is nearest to us, and therefore seems complicated, although it is really simple.

Like the seemingly unsolvable abstract mathematical problem, which opens out into a series of beautiful sequences as soon as one has found the key to the problem, so does the seemingly complicated problem of man's life. As soon as we recognize that the key to the mystery is the control of the animal life by enlightened reason, the mystery disappears, and in its place we find the simple harmonies of the true life.

CHAPTER V

THE TRUE LAW OF LIFE

To give up seeking our own happiness as animals is the true law of the life of humanity. That is the thing that the animal nature of man does not see at all, and which the higher nature, so long held in thrall by the false view of life prevalent among men, does not fully realize immediately upon its awakening. Like the man whose blind eyes were opened we see dimly "men as trees walking." Our bodily life, which we perceive because it lies so near to us, seems so complicated and so full of needs, that we think the true object of life must be to fulfill the bodily demands. We spend our days in a vain effort to understand and to satisfy the animal nature, yet we are as far from happiness in the end as at the beginning.

Reason shows us that the satisfaction of the animal nature is not, and cannot be, the true end of man's life. If it were, man would not need the qualities that mere animals do not possess. He would not be filled with doubts, cares and longings which the pursuit of animal happiness can neither destroy nor satisfy.

Robert Browning had this thought in mind when he wrote these lines:

> " Poor vaunt of life indeed,
> Were man but formed to feed
> On joy, to solely seek and find and feast;
> Such feasting ended, then
> As sure an end to men;
> Irks care the crop full bird? Frets doubt the
> maw-crammed beast? "

We see that in the case of a mere animal any activity that is opposed to its physical welfare is a renunciation or sacrifice of its life. This is inevitably so because its only life is the animal life, and to oppose it is so far to destroy it. Man has not only the animal life, but also a higher life, and so for him to renounce the satisfaction of animal desires does not mean destruction, rather just the reverse. It is through losing or renouncing the animal life that man comes into the higher life. This is the essence of Christ's meaning when he said, " He that loseth his life for my sake "— i. e., for the sake of my teachings concerning the higher life —" only the same shall find it."

Besides, if we do not renounce the pursuit of animal happiness here and now while life is strong in us, and while we may choose which nature we shall serve, we must renounce it unwillingly at our

deaths. We know, whatever our beliefs may be concerning the future of man, that when the body dies it is no longer the vehicle of our personal consciousness. If life consist in the pursuit of animal happiness, then, when death compels us to renounce our physical life, all that we have sought ends in nothing.

For, the body, with its occupations and functions, is merely one of the instruments of life, and not life itself. Life manifests itself in many forms in the kingdoms of nature, yet nowhere do we confound the manifestation with life itself. The flower is not the life of the plant, any more than are the roots, the stem or the leaves — these are but the instruments through which plant life manifests itself, and when we have studied them in the light of all the natural laws man has yet discovered, we are as far as ever from knowing just what the life of the plant is which thus manifests itself through fulfillment of the laws of its own being.

"Flower in the crannied wall,
I pluck you out of the crannies,
I hold you here, root and all, in my hand
Little flower — but *if* I could understand
What you are, root and all, and all in all,
I should know what God and man is."

— (*Tennyson.*)

The animal exists through force and matter in harmony with their laws, and, because to the animal that is all there is of life, he fulfills the law of his being by such existence. Man exists in the same way, but to him that animal existence is only an incident of life, not the whole of it. It is because he fails to see this, and does not live according to his higher nature which is the fulfillment of life, that he gets pain and disappointment here.

Renunciation of the chase after animal happiness is the true law of human life, and to try to live contrary to this is to violate the law of our being and to bring about disharmony and suffering. Man, after he has once had a glimpse of his own higher nature, when once he has passed beyond the recognition of " I am " and has felt " I love," may no longer be absorbed in the animal life with happiness or profit to himself.

If he does not through submission to the higher reason, freely renounce this search for animal pleasure, then it will be renounced for him violently at the death of the flesh. When man subordinates his higher nature to the pursuit of animal gratifications he approaches the hour of physical dissolution called death so burdened by the consequence of his suffering and disappointment, that he desires nothing but surcease from

sorrow and the assurance of passing into another form of existence.

The consciousness of his perishing personality, the ending of the life which has been everything to him, yet has never satisfied him, is torture to man, and he clings to the hope the ecclesiastical teachers hold out, that in another life beyond the grave he shall find new and better conditions, where he may pursue his personal existence with joy and satisfaction. This hope, which is the only fruit of his life here, is the sole thing between him and the madness of despair. All his eager pursuit of happiness has brought him no reward save this hope born of unfulfilled desire.

But regeneration, or spiritual birth, consists in learning that animal happiness is not the object of our lives. Regeneration is the death of the animal nature through the renunciation of its desires; and the unfolding of the spiritual nature through the recognition of its own purposes and possibilities. When a man sees that his true life consists in controlling animal desires by the exercise of his true reason, he first understands what regeneration really is. The old hopes and desires, the old selfish ambitions, the old personal aims, dissolve as mist dissolves before the sun. He knows that they were never real, but simply the veil that prevented his seeing the true light.

In the glow of the true light he finds joy and satisfaction; qualities blossom into thoughts, aims and actions whose fragrance neither he nor those about him hitherto dreamed of.

Those who have not had this birth can no more understand what it is, than the dry seed can anticipate its bursting into a plant. All the powers and possibilities are there, but they have not burst through the husk of the false view of man's life as a pursuit of animal happiness. These are they who, having not yet felt more than "I am," are unable to realize the joy of that higher feeling "I love."

CHAPTER VI

THE GOOD OF LIFE

ALTHOUGH feeling that happiness for himself is impossible each man spends his life in pursuit of it, constantly chasing a will-o'-the-wisp, mistaking it for the light of life. The disappointment which follows effort to secure happiness for ourselves leads us to think that the failure is due to some unusual demand of our nature to which life is not equal.

We recognize the pursuit of happiness not only as an inherent right of each living human being, but we further consider it a necessary expression of life itself. We have no choice but to seek it, though the search ends always in disappointment and suffering. It must be so while we seek individual happiness, and have no larger conception of the purposes of life.

We are not content with seeking personal happiness, a pursuit that we know in advance must end in failure, but we also try to make others prefer our happiness to their own. And in this effort the failure is yet more sure. Given a group

of men, whether of ten or a million, each one sure that the purpose of his life is personal happiness, and that it may be secured only by pursuing his own desires, at any cost to his fellows, and it is easy to see how hopeless is the task of him who tries to persuade them to prefer his happiness to their own. Yet vain as is this effort, futile as it must remain while men hold this view of life, we persist in the attempt, and so we come to look upon life as a series of painful experiences.

We never learn that happiness can be attained only by considering the good of others as our own. If each one could see this, and could strive for it as earnestly as we now strive for personal good — the pain and disappointment of man's life would disappear. We should then be living in accordance with our higher nature, and in harmony with the law of our being. Only in this way can the useless contest in which man is engaged — the strife not only between his own two natures for supremacy, but also the strife between himself and every other man for the gratification of his own desires — only in this way can all that vain strife be ended.

If we admit the truth of this doctrine, though unable to live it wholly from day to day because the effects of our false view of life must first be purged away — even this admission will lead us

to abandon the false and material object of life, which gets further and further away the more we pursue it. If man could secure happiness by selfish gratification of animal desires only, what incentive would there be for living in accordance with his higher nature? If his concept of life were bounded by the animal view, his higher nature would inevitably disappear, just as some of our physical organs have disappeared when the conditions of life made them no longer necessary to us. That an animal or a merely animal man, "the brutish man," should get entire happiness through selfish gratification is all right. Like Watt's dogs that "delight to bark and bite, it is his nature to." But if a child of the spirit could get happiness that way, it would be a calamity to him, for it would kill his desire and progress toward higher things. It is the failure to secure the end we seek through selfish indulgence that helps us to see the truth and beauty of the unselfish or selfless aim when it is presented to us.

When we are able to admit the truth of the doctrine that happiness may be found only through considering the good of others as our own, we lose our fear of death. Our fear of death is really our dread of losing, through the death of our flesh, the happiness of the animal life, the only happiness known to the animal man.

The body being to us the instrument upon which Life plays its wondrous symphony, we cannot conceive of the destruction of that instrument as other than a calamity. We fear the approach of Death, and misinterpret its meaning and possibilities so long as we regard personal happiness as the sole aim of life.

But when we have learned to regard the good of others as our own; when we know that in order to be enduring, our happiness must be based upon the happiness of all, then death ceases to look like the discontinuance of happiness. For so long as the good of others is our good, happiness continues, and can be no less though we may be no longer individual, conscious sharers in it. We are, no matter under what circumstances, a part of it, and the happiness of our individual selves having ceased to be our aim, our true happiness is not affected by the death of the flesh.

To this statement the troubled and erring heart of man replies "But that is not life. Renunciation of life is suicide." Then the rational feeling to which we have submitted our animal desires when we grasp the true view of life, rejoins: "I know nothing about that. I know that such is the life of man, and that there is no other, and that there can be no other. There can be only one true idea of life, and that is the idea in accord

with man's higher nature. I know that such a life is true life and happiness, both for one person and for all the world. One of the marked proofs that the doctrine is true lies in this, that it makes equally for the happiness of the individual and of the mass. No other idea of life applies to every phase of life.

"I know that what you call enjoyment shall become happiness for you only when you shall not seize for yourself, but when others shall give of theirs to you. Man is so constituted that he cannot find happiness in selfish pleasures. He cannot transmute sensual enjoyments into higher joy, and when you have learned that you are a part of all others, and not a separate individual, you will know this beyond a doubt. It is then that you will recognize enjoyments to be superfluous and irksome, as they really are, when you seize them for yourself. You know now that they are not satisfying, then you will know that they are not even desirable.

"You shall free yourself from actual sufferings only when others, and not you yourself, shall release you from them. Though this may seem impossible to you now, reflection will show you that you know it to be true. Your sufferings now while still in the animal life are not confined to yourself alone. You cause suffering to others by

the pursuit of your aims without regard to theirs, and they cause suffering to you by pursuing a similar course. Your suffering is increased by their suffering, and theirs by yours.

"Already you know that you cannot by yourself avoid sufferings in life. You have tried to save yourself pain, you have striven to secure your own happiness without considering others, and have failed. You have regarded their loss as your gain, only to find that you were mistaken, and that the end sought brought no happiness when achieved. You look ahead, and see nothing but similar pain and disappointment awaiting you, and through fear of these anticipated sufferings which seem so unavoidable to you, you are tempted to deprive yourself of life itself, by suicide, rather than face these sufferings.

"The more I love myself and strive with others," continues the Rational Man in the argument raging within yourself, "the more will others hate me, and the more viciously will they struggle with me. This I know to be true by what I have seen of the effect of the opposition of others to my efforts to secure my own pleasures. While other men oppose my animal nature, and prevent the gratification of my bodily desires, I am moved to struggle more desperately against them, more and more hopeful that by their defeat shall the battle

for my happiness be won. Out of such a struggle can come nothing but hatred and further strife, and through it their opposition to me is increased many fold.

"I know that the more I hedge myself in from suffering the more torturing it will become. If I regard anything as 'bad' for me and wholly undesirable, and if yet it comes to me; if I spend my time trying to avoid it, yet find it thrusting itself upon me at every turn, then is its power to hurt me multiplied enormously, and the merest trace of that undesirable thing in my life becomes an exquisite torture.

"I know, too, that the more I guard myself against death, the more terrible will it appear. The more I hold the view that in the body and its demands lies the whole of life that I may know, the more dreadful will the thought of the destruction of that body become. The fear of such a possibility will blanch my cheek, check my enjoyment of any pleasure, and may, indeed, so fill my mind with dread foreboding that in the very frenzy of fear I may myself compass that death whose anticipation drove me to madness.

"I know that, whatever a man may do, he can attain to no happiness until he shall live in harmony with the law of his life; and life itself has

shown me that its law consists in the renunciation of the animal self and the control of the higher self through reason."

CHAPTER VII

THE LIFE UNIVERSAL

A REASONING man cannot fail to see that if we admit the possibility of replacing the striving for our own happiness with a striving for the happiness of other beings, life will become rational and happy.

Because as soon as the reason is awakened, and man sees that there is more than animal existence in his life, he begins to realize that this greater thing is not confined to himself. At first dimly, but afterwards more clearly, he perceives that he is nothing, can feel nothing, can have nothing that does not belong to the lives of all other men. That all having the same needs and the same feelings, happiness through the fullest satisfaction of those needs and the expression of those feelings depends upon mutuality.

When once we see this clearly, the renunciation of the selfish, personal life becomes not merely desirable, but actually necessary to us. We see that it was not a mistake to expect to find happiness in life, but that our mistake lay in our conception

of how we could secure it. Now that our spiritual eyes are open, and we see that the higher life is the only true life of man, we are led by the very beams that enlightened us to seek happiness through the good of others. We feel that there is no other way to get it, and until we see this our lives are poverty-stricken and valueless.

It could not be otherwise, for until we see this and live it, we are carrying on our life in direct violation of the law of our being. It is plain to each of us that even a machine operated in opposition to the plan upon which it was constructed will not only fail to fulfill its purpose, but will also suffer injury and even destruction. How much more apparent is it that only pain and failure can ensue while men live in opposition to the law of their being? That the only way to make their lives valuable to themselves or others is to recognize the law and conform to it?

Humanity is making some progress in this direction, not only in regard to the relations of man to man, but also in regard to the relations of man toward the lower animals. Even the criminal code, the existence of which is the best proof that mankind has not yet seen the true law of life, is being modified into a greater semblance of humanity as the number of those who understand man's life increases.

In the struggles that arise between races and nations that still seek their own good at the expense of the rest of the world, there is now less frequent recourse to war. In national councils, the force of the lives and teachings of those who see life aright, has its influence, albeit not often known or understood by the councilors. Old men have seen visions, and young men have dreamed dreams of the day that is to dawn, when humanity, knowing that happiness can be found only in the good of all, rather than of the individual, shall forever cease to war with itself. And these dreams are already being translated into the life of nations. The lust for killing other creatures is disappearing, and exploitation is taking the place of murder. More animals are domesticated and made useful, while men kill fewer even for food, and are learning in larger and larger numbers to subsist on the eggs and milk rather than on the flesh. Man is learning to restrain his destructiveness as he understands his proper relation to life.

Because of this progress that humanity has made we condemn the search for mere gratification. The effect of this general condemnation may be seen in the more temperate use of alcohol and other things that minister merely to the animal craving for excitement and gratification of the lusts of the flesh. Even conventional society no

longer regards regular inebriety as a trifling lapse, nor tolerates licentiousness as an amusing weakness.

This may well be due in large measure to the mere growth of refinement in our methods of gratifying animal desires; but it is still more largely due to the recognition that excess means shattered nerves and weakened impulses even for the next generation; that man may not indulge his own desires at the expense of others. We have come to approve abstinence from all such selfish indulgence of the animal nature, and have begun to worship the sacrifice of that animal self for the good of others. Not merely because it is the good of others, but also because there can be no real good for ourselves which does not include the good of others.

This is in short the recognition that there is no good but Love. It is Love that makes it impossible for us to find "good" or happiness for ourselves in what is "bad" or painful for others, so that we seek our pleasure in the happiness of others and thus find it.

"The commandment in which my whole teaching is expressed is this only, that all men should love one another. Love consists in the laying down of our bodily life for others."— (*Spirit of Christ's Teaching,* p. 229.)

Simple men who labor with their hands, more generally acknowledge that the best life is to give themselves to others. Their daily labor consists in producing things whose value lies in exchange. They see that to get even the necessaries of life, the food, clothes and shelter the body demands, requires them to produce something that their fellows need and will therefore take in trade.

Seeing this in their daily social relations makes it easier for them to grasp the truth that true happiness — the welfare of the spiritual nature — like the bodily welfare — lies in giving themselves and their service to the needs of others.

"I understand now that the true welfare is possible for me only on condition that I recognize my fellowship with the whole world. I believe this, and the belief has changed my estimate of what is right and wrong, important and despicable. What once seemed to me right and important — love of country, love for those of my own race, for the organization called the State, services rendered at the expense of the welfare of other men, military exploits — now seem to me detestable and pitiable. What once seemed to me shameful and wrong — renunciation of nationality, and the cultivation of cosmopolitanism — now seem to me right and important. . . . I can no longer coöperate with measures main-

tained by divisions between states,— the collection of custom duties, taxes, the manufacture of arms and projectiles, or any act favoring armaments, military service, and, for a stronger reason, wars, — neither can I encourage others to take any part in them." (*M. R.*, pp. 256–7. Ed. 1885.)

It is the "cultivated" intellects that defend selfishness on economic or philosophic or moral grounds. They have seen that there is no happiness to be found in the gratification of the baser animal desires, but they have not yet recognized the true life. They indulge the mental desires and appetites for knowledge, either for its own sake, or for the advantage it gives them personally over their less advanced fellows. Or else they indulge their desires for the sake of the power and the prominence and self-satisfaction it brings; or their desires for beauty because of the sensuous delight it affords the mentally developed man.

They spend their time gratifying such tastes which are in reality no less selfish than the animal lusts, and are like the animal lusts in that they grow stronger and more numerous the more they are recognized. Such men first cultivate, then stimulate, then try to satisfy demands that hide from them the true view of life as completely as does the indulgence of the merely physical desires.

Not through the cultivation, or stimulation and

satisfaction of such intellectual desires shall man find happiness. " I cannot help repeating that our happiness or unhappiness cannot in the least depend upon whether we lose or acquire something, but only on what we are ourselves."—(*M. L.*, letter to his wife, 1884, 197.) Rather shall man find happiness through discarding all such vain and selfish ends, and submitting to true reason, that reason which points out that the individual's happiness is bound up in mankind's happiness, and that it cannot be gained through sacrifice of others but only by the renunciation of the selfish animal life.

CHAPTER VIII

DESIRE

"DESIRES" are as numerous as the radii of a circle, and can never be satisfied. The whole of the animal life is made up of desires, and these become no fewer in number to the "cultivated" intellect, they merely change their form. One who looks in the shops, or in the libraries, may realize that all activities show the multiplicity of desires. The desire for food led man first to hunt and fish and, afterwards, to till the soil. The desire to possess that which fills some need or pleases the fancy makes men endure great exertion and even terrible privation if thereby they may be assured of securing their heart's desire.

A book is written and printed because of the desire of the author to let others know the thoughts and fancies that have occupied his mind. This may be due to an unselfish desire to share whatever happiness he has known with as many others as possible, or it may be due to that egotism which forces us all at times to endeavor to impress ourselves upon our fellows. Whether it be invention

or discovery, book-making or manufacturing; whether it be noble self-sacrifice or cruel murder, good or bad, loving or hating, the underlying cause of all alike is desire.

We waste our time trying to gratify all the desires of the flesh, hoping thus to satisfy them. The gratification of one leads to the creation of another and so they increase, causing artificial needs that oppress and depress us by their weight and insistence. We know the saying of the Greek philosopher, "I like to go to the market-place to see how many things there are that I can do without."

Even one of these innumerable desires, if sufficiently dwelt upon, may take possession of a man's whole being. For the gratification of this one desire which has superseded every other purpose of life, a man will spend years toiling, saving, suffering; forgetting his relations to the rest of the world, regarding every obstacle in the way of his success as a great evil, and looking with suspicion upon any who seem to thwart him in his endeavor. Even other desires that call him in other directions are ruthlessly trampled underfoot that the one absorbing wish may be gratified. Circumstances are twisted to meet the needs of the moment, life is narrowed to the one purpose of furthering this desire. Should he in the end fail

to accomplish it, he is bereft of all happiness or of even a hope of happiness from any other course; should he succeed he is still worse off, for the fulfillment never brings with it the happiness he had hoped for. He feels that he has lost all he staked; he looks upon his life as broken or wasted, and upon himself as bankrupt in both purpose and achievement. To such a man this is all that life seems to mean and to bring.

How can it be otherwise when our acknowledged teachers admit that the highest perfection of man consists in the number and development of all sides of his refined desires. This is the teaching that has led us to believe that only when our wants are many, and our desires too complicated to allow us to live simply or to have time to examine our relation to our fellows, are we living at all. This it is that causes man's inhumanity to man. Our own needs and desires press so closely upon us that we are unable to feel the needs of others. If we see them at all, we see them only as obstacles to the fulfillment of our own aims, obstacles that must be overthrown, which otherwise will overthrow us.

Such teaching makes men think that they feel only personal animal or mental desires; that this is natural, and that to renounce them would be unnatural and, therefore, impossible. It is this feel-

ing that makes us regard the Golden Rule as an impossible counsel of perfection in actual life. But, as Henry George has said, "To do unto others as we would that they should do to us, is not a mere counsel of perfection."

Renunciation seems to us to be the death of life, not merely the death of selfish desire; and it must continue to seem so while we regard the multiplicity and complexity of our needs as the proof that our life is larger and fuller than when our wants are few and simple.

The fact that we want the largest and highest expression of life which we have yet conceived, is in itself a proof of the existence of our higher nature, though it is still in bondage to the physical nature. When we come to understand that higher nature, we learn that it is not the renunciation of our individual desires that is required, but rather their subjection to the higher reason or "Wisdom." Herein is the true law of life.

This belief is not merely an intellectual perception arrived at by study, as our mental desires are. There is nothing truly "higher" in the mental than in the physical desire. It is merely a less gross method of gratifying selfish aims, and, because of that added refinement, more dangerous to the development of the true idea of life. Men who live on what is called the mental plane de-

velop a feeling of superiority that stands as an impassable barrier between them and their fellows who are not so intellectually cultivated. The purely animal man accepts matter as expressed in his physical body as the whole of life and lives solely to fill its demands. The intellectual man seeks the laws that govern material existence, finding in conformity to them the whole purpose of life.

But the true law of life cannot be found by examining matter. It is a spiritual understanding, and is perceived by a spiritual illumination. This illumination may come suddenly, suffusing our whole path of life, as it came to Saul of Tarsus as he journeyed toward Damascus, blinding us with its great light; or it may be in a more gradual way until perhaps the word of some Philip, who joins us on our journey, may show us the true idea of life, and then and there we cry, "I believe," and "go on our way rejoicing." This spiritual illumination may be had by anyone who opens his soul to it by willingness to receive and to act in accordance with the law of life. To any such the quickening of the spiritual understanding may come at any moment and for him to whom it comes, life and his idea of life are changed in the twinkling of an eye. The renunciation of selfish aims becomes no longer an unnatural or im-

possible task, ending in death, but a natural and joyous rule of life through the exercise of which we find life " more abundantly."

CHAPTER IX

UNITY OF OUR LIVES

For man, entrance into life and the course of life, is like the experience of a horse which the master leads from the stable for harnessing.

On coming out of the stable into the light, and scenting liberty, it seems to the horse that in that liberty is life, yet he is harnessed and driven off. He feels a weight behind him, and, if he thinks that his life consists in running regardless of others, he begins to kick, falls down and, indeed, may kill himself. But if he does not fall, he has two courses open to him; either he will go his way quietly, and drag his load, finding that the burden is light to him, and that trotting is not a torment, but a joy; or else he will kick himself free. Then his master will lead him to the treadmill and will fasten him by a halter; the platform will begin to slide beneath him, and he will walk in the dark, confined to one place, suffering. But his strength will not be wasted; he will perform his unwilling labor, and the law will be fulfilled in him. The difference will be in this, that the first work would

be joyful, but the second compulsory and painful.

The satisfaction of all simple, normal wants is guaranteed to man as it is to the bird and the flower; provided that in his own sphere, man live a simple, reasonable life, as birds and flowers do in their spheres. (Matt. VI, 20, to end.)

The man who recognizes life as simple, and lives it on the simple plane, governed by higher reason, finds joy and satisfaction entirely unknown to the man who spends his energy in cultivating desires and his time in endeavoring to satisfy them. The simple needs being the only true needs, their satisfaction alone is guaranteed. To every man daily comes the call, "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve"— the physical man or the higher reason. If happiness lies only in conforming to the true law of life, and we choose rather to fulfill the desires of the flesh, how shall we expect to find our life here other than a dark and painful mystery ending in the still darker, more painful mystery which we call death?

The larger part of mankind accepts, under the name of Buddhism, this truth that life supplies man's simple needs; but the vast spread of that religion renders it subject to corruption, and these corruptions are regarded by cultured persons as disproving the truth of the religion itself. This is as if one who had seen the sun's rays only

through stained glass should deny the existence of the pure, white light of day; forgetting that the medium through which light came to him might stain it, but could not alter the true qualities of light, or disprove them. As the stained glass affects light, so man's false idea of life blurs his conception of the truth of life. His conception of his animal existence as the whole of life colors his understanding. As Shelley says, "Life, like a many-colored dome, stains the white radiance of Eternity"— but he who has once seen the higher life knows that the white radiance of Eternity has not been dimmed.

Though the larger part of mankind does so understand the law of life, and gets from its observance quiet of mind; and although it is impossible to understand life and get into harmony with it in any other way, yet this does not in the least disturb the Scribes and Pharisees. They continue to teach the masses who look upon them as leaders, the same old doctrines that have been tried for centuries and proved wanting. That the control of the animal desires by the higher reason is the only true law of life, is regarded by them as a mere "theory," and according to them progress and invention have superseded such oldtime "theories."

No glimpse of the truth that progress and in-

vention are in themselves but aids to man's spiritual development when rightly used and understood, comes to them. These processes, meant to simplify life and enable men to satisfy mere physical needs more easily, thus leaving more time for living the real life of man, are by these teachers construed into so many more proofs of the complexity of animal requirements.

Unlike the Scribes and Pharisees, the Hindoo sees that there is a contradiction between the life for the flesh and the higher life, and he is solving it according to his light. So far he truly lives. When the blind man's eyes were first opened he saw "men as trees walking," but this was an advance over not seeing motion at all, and was but the preliminary stage of seeing men walking as men. Thus the Hindoo, despite the corruptions that have crept into his religion is better off than the modern materialist who is like a beast that does not yet perceive any higher life. Yet the perception of the altruistic life is the most valuable product of the experience of the ages. We see the truth of this the moment we feel "I love," for it is this altruistic perception of life which has led to the development of all man's ideals and fine qualities. Friendship, courage, gentleness, meekness, temperance, loving-kindness and love itself are the fruits of the higher life. In the animal man they

are merely rudimentary, and affect the conduct only when they appear to be advantageous to the individual.

Some of these are found even in the beasts in this rudimentary stage, although they have little use for them in their lives. There is this distinction, however, between the states of beasts and of men. The higher the animal is, the more complex are its parts and the more dependent are the parts upon one another. There are some worms so simply constructed that if one is cut in two, we have two worms; if the higher animal is cut in two, both parts are dead. So with the state of mankind. The birds and the fish live, from their nature, each to itself; each is but slightly dependent upon any other; each suffers for its errors mainly in itself.

With the higher organism of Man the parts are more dependent upon one another. Man cannot live in a world of men, and be happy or successful without the coöperation of other men. We may not ignore our relation to our fellows, nor our dependence upon them. Everything in man's life shows the necessity of unity rather than separateness.

Interior happiness we may find each for ourselves by opening our eyes to look for and follow our better nature, submitting our lives to the con-

trol of the higher reason. "Peace I give unto you," said Jesus. But when we have found this peace each for himself by the control of animal desires, we find that we are more nearly one than before because the same law works in us all.

But exterior well-being cannot be found through each seeking his own desire, but rather through inducing our fellows also to come out into the light of the true life. Just as we could not find happiness until we had lost the false view of life and found the true law, and got into harmony with it, so our brethren can know no real happiness until the same experience is theirs.

Experience teaches us that while our fellows suffer and struggle held in the bondage of the false idea of life, the welfare of them and of ourselves even in external things cannot be established. For we are an army marching together, in which "no man liveth to himself and no man dieth to himself."

CHAPTER X

THE DUAL NATURE

THE argument of pessimistic philosophers is the same as that of the commonplace suicides and contains its own contradiction. Man's nature, say they, contains one "I" that has an inclination or desire for a full animal life, which desire cannot possibly be gratified; and a second "I" that has no inclination for life, seeing the futility of it all.

If, therefore, I yield to the being that inclines to animal life, I live senselessly; there is no "good" in it worth having, for though I grasp it I cannot hold it and my desires are never satisfied. Full animal life consists in the satisfaction of all desires and if such satisfaction is impossible then it is indeed foolish to waste my efforts in attempting to live the animal life.

If on the other hand I yield to the being that sees the futility of life, there remains to me no desire for life. For how can a man desire that which he sees to be futile and worthless? This second "I" does not believe that it is good to live for

God or for others, it sees my life only as something myself possesses separate from the life about or around me, and considers the possession of that valueless. This "I" tolerates life so long as it does not become tiresome, but when this worthless life becomes wearisome to me, I leave it.

This is "the darkness that comprehendeth not the light." This is the contradictory idea of life that men had reached before Solomon's time, the Wise Man who taught that wisdom was to be esteemed above rubies and much fine gold, and thus set upon the real life a fresh estimate of value that even the animal man could understand. Before the time of Buddha men walked in this darkness and some to-day still see nothing more in life; false teachers like Schopenhauer and Hartmann, pessimists, would lead men back from the light into the blackness of material night.

The teaching of Truth has ever been that man possesses here and now, an actual and inalienable happiness, which is within the reach of everyone. This happiness is familiar to everyone and every unperverted human soul is drawn to it. It is the natural expression of the higher life toward which every man is inclined. It is the end toward which the race has striven, at times diverted from the straight path and groping blindly at times, but driven ever by the unexpressed higher nature to

seek happiness in every way that offers, until it has learned how futile are all ways but one.

It is our false idea of life that keeps us from plainly seeing this truth, that we can be happy; but children and the unsophisticated know the feeling that solves all the contradictions of human life, and gives the greatest possible happiness: this is Love.

We talk of love, and many say "I love," who know nothing about love, whence it comes, or what it means. But to *feel* love is to know what love is by its own evidence. Jesus said a tree is known by its fruit and he who *feels* love is known by the evidences of love in his daily life.

Love is one form of the animal nature brought under the rule of the higher law. Its highest development is the only reasonable activity of mankind. Man is not a victim of contrary desires which prevent harmony with himself and with his fellows and the rest of the universe; he appears so only to those who find the two natures of man seemingly at war with one another.

Love is the highest expression of the higher reason, but it is also in the undeveloped man and is an inherent part of the animal or lower nature. It is the same feeling that, controlled by the higher reason, brings man happiness and harmony, the ends for which life was made. It is only the perversion of love and its application to purely selfish

aims because of our false idea of life, that makes it bring pain instead of joy.

The awakening of the animal personality is always first, because until man has realized the "I," his own existence, he cannot say "*I* feel," nor can he understand "I love" as the highest expression of that conscious existence and of that feeling — this animal personality demands happiness. This demand, instead of separating man's two natures, should unite them more closely, and it does unite them when properly understood; it suggests to us, indeed, their perfect unity. It is when we understand this demand as applying only to our individual selves that we find life a series of painful, disappointing experiences with no other explanation than that it tends to perfect a race; or that we find life endurable only through the belief in another life where we shall fulfill our selfish purposes without pain.[1]

[1] According to the doctrine of the Church, men have a right to happiness, and this happiness is not the result of their own efforts, but of external causes. This conception has become the base of science and philosophy. Religion, science and public opinion all unite in telling us that the life we now live is bad, and at the same time they affirm that the doctrine which teaches us how we can succeed in ameliorating life by becoming better, is an impracticable doctrine. Religion says that the doc-

Either view leaves us unsatisfied, and makes of life a useless striving.

True reason from the heart shows us the misery of strife and how impossible it is to secure peace through strife; it shows us, too, that there can be no happiness in selfishness, that when we feel love we must act love, and that love has nothing to do with selfishness. True reason shows us that the only real happiness possible for us is life in which there shall be no strife, no satiety, and no end.

Our own experience of the animal life has proved that none of the selfish happiness we sought was won without contest both with ourselves and with our fellows, and that the strife brought us more pain than pleasure, more suffering than joy. Further, we have learned that the selfish aim won at such cost quickly palled upon us and its enjoyment was ended before it had well begun.

trine of Jesus, which provides a reasonable method for the improvement of life by our own efforts, is impracticable because Adam fell and the world was plunged into sin. Philosophy says that the doctrine of Jesus is impracticable because human life is developed according to laws that are independent of the human will. In other words, the conclusions of science and philosophy are exactly the same as the conclusion reached by religion in the dogmas of original sin and the redemption.— (*M. R.*, 168.)

But when we hearken to what true reason teaches, lo, like a key made for this one lock, every man finds in his own soul a feeling that gives him the very happiness his reasonable heart tells him is the only true happiness. He sees his life and the life of his fellows as one, and each and all a part of that larger life towards the fullness of which he may move only through unselfish love, the love that feels and knows that in the good of all lies the good of each, and that it cannot be obtained in any other way. "What I see in Christianity is not an exclusively divine revelation, nor a mere historical phenomenon, but a teaching which gives the meaning of life."—(*S. C. T.*, 151.)

CHAPTER XI

THE SELFISH LOVE

SELFLESS love, unlike the selfish kind, not only solves the contradictions of life, but uses the contradictions of life to show itself; for animal individuals suffer, and to remedy this suffering constitutes the chief activity of love. The animal individual desires, and proceeds selfishly to gratify his desires, with resulting pain and disappointment. Love will show the animal man that these desires are worth gratifying only when they include all, and that such gratification alone will bring true pleasure. Thus the seeming contradiction between pleasurable desires and painful fulfillment is reconciled, and we learn that the only desire which ends in individual pain is the desire we try to fulfill for individual pleasure.

Our animal individuality strives to use others. To fulfill our own desires we not only thwart and hinder others in their efforts to gratify their cravings, but we endeavor to divert their efforts on their own behalf to our own benefit. We use the needs of our fellow-creatures, whether those needs

be physical, mental or spiritual to secure for us the gratification we seek. In the material world we use what advantages we naturally or accidentally possess to enable us to secure to our own use a larger and larger share of the "good things of this world." By special laws, by driving hard bargains, by withholding natural rights, by a contest of wills or of brute force, we compel the socially weak to yield up to us that which they produce, save just enough to enable them to continue to produce that we may continue to get.

"Jesus, whom we recognize as God, comes and tells us that our social organization is wrong. We recognize him as God, but we are not willing to renounce our social institutions. What, then, are we to do? Add, if we can, the words 'without a cause' to render void the command against anger; mutilate the sense of another law, as unjust judges have done, by substituting for the command absolutely forbidding divorce, phraseology which permits divorce; and if there is no possible way of deriving an equivocal meaning, as in the case of the commands, 'Judge not, condemn not,' and 'Swear not at all,' then with the utmost effrontery openly violate the rule while affirming that we obey it."—(*M. R.*, 147.)

Then, lest the weak become discontented, and strive on their part to do to us what we have done

to them, we encourage the false teachers to preach to them that what is denied them here will be granted them in another life, if they are but patient and long-suffering. By this means we hope to secure to ourselves undisputed possession of what we wrongfully gained. It is thus the animal individual strives to use others for his selfish advancement.

But Love gives itself to others, and inclines us to the extremest sacrifice of our fleshly existence for others, and in doing that it takes away the fear of death. True Love gives itself freely, seeing that therein is the only way to secure happiness. Self-love throws us into antagonism with all the world; and we know that when we are forced to strive against many, and wrest what we want from others by the force of selfish purpose, there is no time for enjoyment of what we win. That which is won by the sword must be held by the sword, whether or not it is worth the cost. And that which we win by strife with our fellows can only be held by a continuance of that strife, though what we have won may bring us no pleasure. True love recognizes that there can be no selfish good, but that all truth, all happiness must be universal; that only in the happiness of all can the one find happiness. Thus Love gives itself freely to others even to the point of sacrificing its individual existence.

Men fear death only so long as they look upon

the animal life as all there is of life, and death as the end of it. When they have renounced fleshly aims for the higher purposes of life, they recognize that death ends nothing that truly is, but is merely the change that must come before we can enjoy true life to the fullest extent. When death is no longer the end of the passage where darkness is, but the open door into a fuller life, why should men fear it? This understanding of death is not possible to the animal man.

Therefore, those who see nothing in this life but animal existence, say "love involves pain while it lasts, and it will end." These are they who see without perceiving, who hear without understanding. To them love seems as lamentable and as deceptive as all other states of mind. They may recognize something in it that is peculiar,— different and more satisfying, something more important, too, for the individual and the race than any other state of mind, but they do not see the reason and harmony in it. Often it seems to them something irregular and torturing. Their eyes are not open to behold its beauties, but only to be dazzled by its strong light. Something of this feeling must be the effect of sunrise upon an owl.

This misconception is because such persons think of Love as one only among the numberless desires of life, not as the object of life. They do not con-

ceive of man as living for Love, in fact, of thinking Love, acting Love, being Love in all his relations. They see Love dimly, recognizing some of its beauty, and seeing that it is superior to the other desires, but they do not see it as including all that man needs or can express. They think that man should pursue his animal desires with the same intensity of purpose as that with which he follows Love.

"Men," say they in effect, "must sometimes study, sometimes make money, sometimes love." They cannot see that the house divided against itself cannot stand; nor do they remember that the old-time seer with such wavering persons in mind had said, "I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth."

But love cometh not in to sup with such men. They see only the love that is a form of selfishness, the love that sees not all men as one, but as a series of groups, and which transfers the pursuit of their individual happiness to the pursuit of the happiness of their special group.

This is the love that sacrifices others not directly for myself, but for "my child," or "my friend;" the feeling that makes a father, even to his own pain and torture, take the last bit of bread from hungry men in order to provide for his own chil-

dren. In doing this he does not see that he is loving himself through his children more than he loves men, and that for this reason what seems to him noble and unselfish brings him only pain and regret. It is the love through which he who loves a woman, suffers through this love, and causes her to suffer, seducing her, or killing both her and himself because of jealousy. It is the feeling that impels men belonging to one association to injure those of other associations for the sake of upholding their own fellows. It is the feeling that makes a man render himself, and others also, miserable over his favorite occupation, though the occupation in itself may have altruistic qualities that should bring only joy. It is this same feeling that renders a man unable to endure an insult to his "beloved" fatherland, but which does not prevent him rushing into war to avenge that "insult," and strewing the plain with the dead and wounded of his own country, and of others.

CHAPTER XII

ANIMAL LOVE

To love means to do good. We desire good for those whom we love, but we find that to get that good for them alone means injury to others, or at least the neglect of others. When we see this we find ourselves hesitating about taking the "good" we think we want only for those we love as we would hesitate about taking it for ourselves. This hesitation is due, though perhaps unconsciously, to our recognition that to desire happiness only for those who immediately belong to us is little less selfish than to desire it for ourselves alone, and no different in its essence. That sort of desire proves that we are still under the dominion of the animal nature, though the expression of its control is less gross in form.

This partial recognition of the presence of selfishness in our desires for the good of those near and dear to us, leads to much inner questioning. The animal nature, so long indulged, does not let go its hold without a struggle. If it cannot blind the higher nature to the futility of seeking happi-

ness for a few to the injury or neglect of all others, it will present selfishness in a new and more attractive form. It is not content that we shall recognize the necessity of renouncing selfish desires and of seeking our happiness solely through the happiness of others. It does not readily accept the effacement of "I am," so, keeping alive the individuality of each, it leads us to ask, "How far, then, am I to sacrifice myself for the service of others, and whom shall I serve?" And lest that be not sophistical enough to deceive the newly-awakened better self, it further suggests, "How much care may I now take of myself in order to be able later, since I love others, to serve them?"

Over this question the man stumbles who has only begun to know the feeling "I love" and to recognize its demand that selfish desires be renounced. It was the difficult question that the lawyer put to Jesus, "Who is my neighbor?" Jesus' answer to this question in its entirety sent the rich young man sorrowful away.

For we must know that every happiness in the flesh is received by one person only at the expense of the possible happiness that might be obtained by another, or that at least might be given to another. It is this knowledge that causes us to strive with our fellows for what we see as our

personal good, and to wrest it from them without regard to the loss or suffering it may entail upon them. We see that one gets only such desirable things as others fail to get, or even that one gets because another loses and we cannot, while holding the false view of life, conceive that our seeming loss could be gain to us. To get what we desire at any cost to our fellows is the only thing that then seems gain to us.

How then, when partly awakened and longing to throw off the yoke of personal selfishness, are we to decide at whose expense, and in what degree, we shall help those whom it is necessary to serve? All people, or our Fatherland? Fatherland, or our friends? Our friends, or our own wives? Our wives, or our children? Our children, or (in order that we may be able still further to serve others later) ourselves?

All these persons make demands of love, and all the demands are so interwoven that there is no possibility of serving some without depriving others. It seems to the newly-awakened man that he must make a choice and whatever choice he makes will cause pain to him and to others whom he feels he loves and would not willingly hurt. Perplexities and difficulties seem to have increased, and for these difficulties that which the world calls love offers no solution.

Most of the evils amongst men spring from this feeling, falsely called love, which is no more like real love than the life of the animal is like the life of man. As soon as we learn that the life of man does not consist in the number and variety of his animal desires, and that the end and aim of his life is not the gratification of these desires, we begin to perceive that love, too, must be more than animal love, if it is to be worth living for.

To love only our own offspring or those who are so great a part of our lives that we cannot regard existence without them with any degree of complacency or pleasure, is to love just as the animal loves, because these persons are either part of ourselves or necessary to our physical comfort. When a man says that he loves his wife or child or friend, he usually means that the presence of those persons heightens the happiness of his individual life. They are in a sense essential to his enjoyment and he considers their claims upon him superior to all other claims that life may make.

If he can be moved to renounce any personal animal desire, it is only for them, and then less for their good than because he cannot endure that they, being his, should not have what they desire. It is but another form of the same selfishness which he exhibited before he had feelings which he calls love toward any but himself.

But these preferences for certain beings, or things, or occupations, cannot be called love; for they have not the chief mark of love — activity, which has for its aim the happiness of the loved one. The true happiness of the loved ones consists, like our own true happiness, in the control of the animal desires by the higher reason, and the feeling we possess toward our beloved does not tend that way. It rather teaches them to regard their own interests and desires as paramount to all else and so sets their feet in the wrong path; the path that we ourselves have trod and found leading to unhappiness and death.

This violence of preference for some people over others is merely the stock upon which true love and its offshoots may be grafted.

CHAPTER XIII

REAL LOVE

THE possibility of real love begins only when man has comprehended that there can be no happiness for his animal person. For so long as man thinks that the happiness of the animal person is possible, just so long will he strive for that happiness. The fruits of animal happiness are so tangible to the unawakened person! The prizes held out to him by life are wealth, fame, and other forms of power and in the possession of these prizes he thinks he may find happiness. Wealth, fame, and power, or what man regards as wealth, fame and power, are only to be attained by cruel means and selfish ends, and these could not possibly produce true happiness, which must include contentment. "Unless we give up our pretended riches, we shall obtain no real riches. We cannot serve both the false life of the flesh and that of the spirit; we must serve the one or the other. We cannot strive for riches and serve God. What is great in the sight of men is an abomination unto God. Riches to God is an evil thing. The rich

man is wrong in that he eats in abundance and luxury while the beggar hungers at his gate. All should know that the retaining of property for self is a direct non-fulfillment of the will of the Father."—(*S. C. T.*, 192.) . . . (It is to be remembered that Tolstoy is speaking of our social state, which joins poverty to progress. Jesus, however, seems to have believed in a voluntary communism.—ED.) Experience shows us that those who attain these earthly ambitions are never content therewith, but constantly strive by more and more selfish methods to secure more wealth, fame and power.

He who is condemned to immediate death will not concern himself about increasing or preserving his fortune; he will not concern himself about leaving behind him fame or about the triumph of his nation over other nations, or about the discovery of a new planet, and so forth. But a moment before his death he will try to console the one who suffers, he will lift up an old man who has fallen down, he will dress another's wounds, he will mend a toy for a child.—(*C. R.*)

Only he understands genuine love who has not only understood, but has by his life confessed, that he who loves his own soul loses it, and that he who disregards his own soul preserves its everlasting life. If we realize this we must live it out, just

as when we think of the animal life as all there is, we must live according to its desires. If we truly live the higher life, then our lives confess it and we ourselves know the joy of it.

Love is the preference for other beings to one's self, to one's animal personality. If a man prefer the happiness of others to his own animal gratification he shall find joy in that happiness because he is thus following the law of his being. For it is not given to a man to live unto himself alone, and to find therein even the joys of this life. Man, being more than the beast of the field, must find the joy of living in other than the beast's enjoyments.

"Preferring one another in love" creates in man a state of affection toward every person and toward every thing. This is a natural state in the life of little children, who love all things and persons until fear, envy, jealousy or hatred are taught them through what they see and hear about them. This state of affection arises in grown persons, those who have hearkened to the teachings of the Scribes and the Pharisees and have had their hearts hardened thereby, only upon renunciation of selfishness, the death of the animal view of life. This is the "confessing of Christ," in our lives.

How quickly this affection toward all does spring up and take the place of selfishness may be

proved by anyone who will. Let every man try, at least once, when he is ill-disposed toward other people, to say to himself, honestly and from his soul, "It is all the same to me, I need nothing;" and let him, if only for a time, desire nothing for himself.

"Think of death more often and live as if you were to die soon. However you may hesitate how to act, imagine that you are to die in the evening, and your doubts will clear away immediately. You will see clearly what your duty is and what your personal desires are."—(*C. R.*)

By so simple an experiment we shall learn, in proportion to the honesty and sincerity of the renunciation of self, how instantaneously all ill-will or malevolence will disappear. The desire to secure personal gratification, though we must rob our fellow to do it, will no longer control us. We shall see every man, not only as our brother, but as ourself, and know that we cannot take from ourself to give to ourself and thereby gain happiness, but can get it only by giving all.

We shall notice how after this complete renunciation of self, affection toward all things will gush from our hearts, up to that time sealed to selfishness. To break that seal is to set free the true love that is in us which so easily overcomes the animal nature. This process, which proves of

how little avail that view of life is which made us believe that self is all, corresponds in some degree with "the denial of evil" of Christian Science.

But if we stop there, saying only "I need nothing for myself," we shall not find full happiness. We shall prove how natural is the impulse to love, but we shall not know all the joys of unselfish love, not even for one person, until we have forgiven everyone, those who have injured us, and those who treat us unjustly. Jesus taught that to make an acceptable gift on the altar of sacrifice it was necessary, if we remembered aught against our brother, to be reconciled to him before making the gift.

It is not enough that we should simply forgive the offender; we must cease to desire that even the offense shall be punished; and if, through that offense the offender has made a gain, we must even wish him well in the enjoyment of it. For after all, the thought that the wicked must suffer for their evil, either in this life or another, is born of our desire that they should. Such a desire is not born of the higher love, but of self-love. It is the feeling that prompts us to be almost resigned to our loss and disappointment if the other shall have gained nothing that makes him happy.

"You envy another, you are indignant, angry at him, you want to wreak your vengeance on him.

Consider that to-day or to-morrow that man will die, and not a trace will be left of your evil feelings against him."—(*C. R.*)

If we would deny to the lower evil nature any enjoyment that it might get from ill-gotten gain, we might be denying it the only joy of which it was capable. For we may well admit that the nature capable of the higher happiness cannot find enjoyment in evil; while that which can find happiness in evil carries its own punishment in itself because it is denied even the conception of that higher happiness that we have proved to be of inestimable value. Just as the cuckoo, devoid of affection for its young, does not in consequence suffer, but only loses the unspeakable joy of maternity, of which it cannot even conceive.

When we accept the order of Nature which shows forth God's kindness and wisdom; when we can love the offender and forget the offense; when we can free our hearts of all bitterness, asking nothing but to spend and be spent for others; when we shall do this, begins for us the real sweetness of life.

CHAPTER XIV

LOVE'S SACRIFICE

ONLY from such universal affection can spring up genuine love for certain persons, one's relatives or strangers. So long as we love merely in the common way, we are not loving those "others" for whom we imagine we have unselfish, devoted affection; we are really loving ourselves. We strive to secure for them the things we think are good for them: we get our own happiness by so doing, and, after all, it is that personal happiness we are striving for.

The proof of this is found in the fact that we suffer pain and disappointment if those we so love think other thoughts than ours, choose other aims than our aims, or other than those we would choose for them. Or if they desire for their own good something that is not in our hopes and desires for them, we feel that they have not appreciated our affection, and this thought distresses us. When our love for our own springs from that universal, understanding affection that desires nothing for

itself, not even that "our own" shall please us, then we shall no longer suffer through our love. Such love alone solves the apparent contradiction of the animal to the reasonable existence.

Any love that has not for its foundation the renunciation of individuality, that does not include, as a consequence, affection for every one, is merely the life of the animal, and is subject to the same misery and to ever greater miseries, and to still greater folly, than is life without this fictitious love.

When we know only our animal life, and love only our personal self, desiring nothing but what seems for our good, we suffer pain and disappointment so far as we personally fail to get what we want. And when what we call our love includes others, our chances of pain and misery are many times increased by every one we love. If we feel that we must give them what they want, we suffer when we fail in getting it, both for their disappointment and for our own. Thus, parents who think that for their children's sake they must even rob other children if necessary, not only suffer worry and anxiety in their effort to secure this material good, but, after getting it, when they find it does not give the happiness they had hoped for, they endure not only disappointment and resentment, but also the pangs that a reasoning being

must suffer who knows he has been unjust and cruel in vain.

The feeling of passion called love does not remove the conflict of existence, does not free an individual from the pursuit of enjoyments, and does not save from death; on the contrary it still more embitters strife, augments the thirst for pleasures, for oneself and for others, darkens life and increases the terror of death of oneself and of others. If we could not understand life when we saw in it only a contest of ourselves against others for the fulfillment of our own desires, how much less shall we understand it when that contest against hosts is not only for the fulfillment of our personal desires but also for the fulfillment of the desires of those we love? If we pursue enjoyments for ourselves, how much more eager will that pursuit be when we are aiming to wrest from life enjoyments for others? And if we fear death when it means only the giving up of our own animal existence and the destruction of our personal desires, how much more shall we fear it when our personal death seems to mean leaving our friends and their desires behind; and their death seems to mean their destruction and the pain for us of being cut off from them?

The man who seeks his life in the happiness of his animal person, who increases during the whole

course of his life the means of animal happiness, by acquiring wealth and hoarding it, will make others contribute to that animal happiness; he must indeed make them contribute if he is to succeed. Moreover, he will distribute that animal happiness among those persons who are most useful to him for the welfare of his own person. But how is he to devote his life to some persons when his life's support is drawn not from himself, but from the unwilling efforts of other persons? And still more difficult will it be for him to decide to which of the persons preferred he should give the benefits he has attained.

Before he shall be in a condition to love, that is, to do good, forgetting himself, he must cease to hate, that is, to do evil; and he must cease to prefer some persons to others for the sake of the happiness of his own person. The love that is based upon the happiness or well-being of oneself is no better, no less selfish, than the love that is confined to oneself. But the special love for some, which has its root in the understanding love for all, having no element of selfishness in it, has no pain.

The happiness of the life of a man who sacrifices himself through love is as natural as is the well-being of a plant in the light. As the covered plant cannot inquire, and would not in any way

inquire, in what direction it is to grow, or whether the light is good, or whether it must not wait for some other and better light, but instead, takes the only light that exists, and stretches toward it — so the man who has renounced individual happiness does not argue about how much of that of which he has deprived other people he must give up, and to what beloved beings he should give it. Nor does he ask whether there is not some better love than the one that makes the demand. He does not weigh the value of what he has to give against the value of what he is to get. He ceases to think of self or of his individual desires. No longer having his personal gratification for an aim, he gives himself, his being, to the love that is accessible before him. Only such love gives satisfaction to the reasoning nature of man. Love that is less than this is self-love, accompanied as all selfish living is, with disappointment, and with pain.

CHAPTER XV

LIFE IS LOVE

Love is true love only when it is selfless. Only when one gives to another not merely his time and his strength, but when he spends his body for the beloved one, gives up his life for him — only this do we all acknowledge as love; and only in such love do we find happiness, the reward of love. We find happiness because there is no element of strife in such love; no contest either with ourselves or with others. We have no thought of personal gain or advantage. We do not stop to ask "What shall I get from this sacrifice?" nor do we compare what we have done with what is done in return for us. We give of ourselves freely, asking only to spend and to be spent for love's sake.

Exactly in this manner does every laborer for the good of others give his body for the nourishment of another, when he exhausts himself with toil, and brings himself nearer to death. The man who toils to the limit of his strength every day that children may be fed, not merely because

they are *his* children, and must be preserved as part of himself at any cost to others — but because they are children helpless and dependent, and gives of the fruit of his toil freely to any who need, he is every day living this love and getting happiness and peace from it. Such love is possible only to the man who knows no limit to the sacrifice, either of himself or of those beings nearest and dearest to him. For if a man say that he renounces his selfish life, yet sees his own family as needing to be supplied with everything their animal nature claims, he but shifts the center of his animal desires, but has by no means renounced them. Until he can see that life no more consists in fulfilling their desires than in fulfilling his, and that he must renounce their desires as well as his own, he can neither love them truly nor, indeed, know what true love is.

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it; "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Thus, from the old Testament, quoted the lawyer, when the Pharisees sought to entrap Jesus. And Jesus replied, "Thou hast answered right — this do,"— that is, love God and thy neighbor — *"and thou shalt live."* (Matt. XXII, 36–8, with Luke X, 27–8.)

This promise of true life when we truly love is of the same nature as the assurance —" Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." The only way to know life is to *live,* and we shall live when we shall love with our whole nature, and our neighbor as ourself, not *better* than ourself, or *different* or *separate* from ourself, but as ourself, that is as one with ourself, whose good is our good.

" We know that we have passed from death to life," says a disciple of Christ, " because we love the brethren." (I John III, 14.) So shall we know when we have passed from the false view to the true view of life; when we have ceased to serve only our animal desires, and have come to serve all men; for then we shall love the brethren, not because they love us or serve us, not because we can through them obtain our desires, but because thus to love them is the true and harmonious expression of our higher life. True love is indeed the life itself.

Who among living people has not known that blissful sensation that life is love — though it was only during early childhood, before the soul was choked up with the lie that stifled life in us? Who does not recall that blessed feeling of emotion, even if but once experienced, during which one desired to love everybody, both those near to him, his

father and mother, his brothers; and those removed from him, "wicked people" and his enemies and his dog and his horse and even the blade of grass? How it filled, enlarged and satisfied our whole nature! In that moment life was all beauty, all joy, all harmony, either to live or to die was gain, for the fullness of life had been tasted. This is the light that Walt Whitman came to show — the joy of loving and serving all.

When a man feels thus he desires one thing — that it should be well with everybody, that all should be happy, and, still more, he desires that he himself may act so that it may be well with all; that he may give himself and his whole life to making others comfortable and happy. Such a desire leaves no room for self as a separate thing; it cannot conceive of securing happiness through the pursuit of personal pleasures. It sees self only as an expression of all, and all as self. There is no place where the love which creates this desire of giving everything stops to consider what do "I" get out of this relation to my fellows, but instead the love sees "myself" and "others" as one. And this, and this only, is that love in which lies the Life of Man.

This love manifests itself in the soul of Man as a hardly perceptible, tender shoot, in the midst of coarse weeds resembling it. These weeds are

the various material desires of man usually called love. It seems to men, and to each man himself, at first, that from this shoot must grow the tree of real love in which the birds shall shelter themselves; and it seems also that all the other shoots are of the same kind.

At first, men prefer and cultivate the weeds of self-love, which grow fast. As they push up rank and tall, the one shoot of life is stifled, and languishes, for just as in the garden the tall weeds rob the good plants of light and air until they dwindle and even die, so do the lusty selfish desires stifle or kill the tender shoot of true love in the soul.

But men frequently treat this tender shoot even worse than by strangling it through cultivation of the weeds. Having heard that among the number of shoots, there is one which is genuine, life-giving, called Love, but not knowing which it is, they trample it down, and begin to rear another shoot from the weeds, calling this love. This is the love of "one's own, family, friends, or country." Or, worse yet, men seize the shoot with rough hands, crying: "Here it is, we have found it, now we know it, let us train it, love! love! the most elevated sentiment, here it is!" And they begin to transplant it, to correct it; and handle it; and, fighting for it, crush it until

the shoot dies before it has flowered. Then they say: "All this is nonsense, folly, sentimentality." This is the love that would force upon others what we think is for their good; that makes for them laws which suit us; that makes us substitute organized charity for justice; that leads us to give to the poor, because "lending to the Lord" pays well, and to think that by renouncing a few selfish pleasures here we may secure larger happiness in a life hereafter.

But Love needs only one thing — that we should not hide it from the sun of righteousness, which is another name for justice, and which alone will promote its growth.

CHAPTER XVI

THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS

MAN understands the merely visionary and elusive character of the animal existence; this his whole experience has taught him, even before he has been awakened to a higher life. He knows in his heart that setting free the one true life of love within him alone confers happiness — that his whole physical existence is a gradual annihilation of his person, and he cannot but become aware of this on the approach of that person to inevitable death, yet he strives in every way to preserve that perishing existence, and to gratify its desires. In short he spends his strength for that which is not only nothing in itself, and will bring him nothing, but the pursuit of which deprives himself of the possibility of the only happiness in life, which is love. Yet we call man the reasoning animal, though he persists in living without listening to reason, hearkening only to the demands of the flesh.

The activity of men who do not understand life is always directed to a conflict for their own ex-

istence, to the acquisition of enjoyment, to their own deliverance from suffering or to the putting off of inevitable death. Such a conflict is exhausting, and the increase of physical enjoyments itself increases the strain of that conflict as well as adds demand to demand, renders us more sensitive to suffering, and hastens the approach of death. For when we have increased and intensified the suffering of the flesh until the pain has become unendurable, dissolution of the physical body must follow.

When we see death drawing on apace we try to hide from it, and know but one means — the means that has really hastened its approach — still further to increase animal pleasure. Inevitably pleasures reach the limits where they cannot be further increased; from that point they pass into suffering, and leave with us only deepened sensitiveness to suffering, and a more intense shrinking from pain. As death comes ever nearer and nearer, our terror grows more real and soul-racking.

The chief cause of this terror is not clear to those who do not understand life. It does not lie in the thought that death means the end of all the things we have eagerly sought, no, for we know how unsatisfactory such pleasures have proved. Its real source is the realization that what we

have called pleasures (all gratifications of a rich life) are of such a nature that they cannot be shared equally among all men, that what we get somebody else must be without. Therefore, we have taken our pleasures from others, by force if needed, by evil, and by trampling down that kindly inclination toward all people which is the root of love. As the dissolution of the physical body draws near, we realize how useless has been the struggle we have maintained, and we see, as never before, that the only real thing is love.

But the pleasure we have pursued is directly opposed to love, and the more intense the pursuit, the more it is opposed to love. Thus the very intensity and all-absorbing nature of our activity for the attainment of physical pleasures has made more impossible the attainment of the only true happiness accessible to men, which is love.

When we look at life from the physical or selfish standpoint, it seems as though the increase of happiness must proceed from the best external arrangement of one's existence. But what we regard as the best external arrangement — wealth, position, power — in a state of society where all opportunities are restricted, may be secured only by greater and greater violence to other men, which is directly opposed to love.

It appears to us that the existence of a poor

laborer, or of a sickly man is evil, unhappy, because we look upon life as purely physical. The existence of a rich or healthy man seems to us good and happy, because he has the things that belong to the physical life. Therefore, we bend all the strength of our minds to escaping a poor, sickly, evil, unhappy existence, and to obtaining for ourselves a rich, healthy, good and happy one. This is consistent enough with a false view of the purpose of life, and so long as we hold that view we must pursue selfish pleasures and seek selfish profit.

While we see life this way we think that the advancement of mankind consists in devising and handing down better means to gain such a life. We believe that every new thing that makes it easier to secure our selfish pleasures, no matter at what expense to our fellows, is a sign of progress. We talk much of the progress of our age, although through the very multiplication of these progressive means of gratifying all our animal desires, and creating new ones that had no existence heretofore, we oppress our brother still more, and thrust upon him a refinement of cruelty and suffering unknown in a less progressive age.

Holding this view we vie with one another in endeavoring to delay death by pampering the desires of the body, tempting the palate with new

foods for which the world has been put under tribute, clothing ourselves in "purple and fine linen," cultivating our minds, multiplying our pleasures, and by every means maintaining, as well as possible, the pleasing life which we have inherited from our parents, or organizing for ourselves a new and still more pleasurable life. All of which is erroneous and futile.

When we get the first glimpse of the true life of man, we are sometimes beset by the habits of the past. We cling to old beliefs, old customs, old ideas as to what is necessary for our welfare. We know these accessories have failed to satisfy us, yet we fear we shall not be satisfied without them. We must, however, learn, each one of us, whatever crusts of prejudice we have to break and however painful it may be, to stamp into our own hearts this truth, that there is no good but love, and no evil but self-love. To these words only opens the door of Happiness.

CHAPTER XVII

THE FEAR OF DEATH

"THERE is no death," says the voice of Truth. "I am the Resurrection and the Life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live. And every one that liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

"Jesus' meaning was that the dead are living in God. God said to Moses, 'I am the God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob.' To God all those who have lived the life of the son of man are living. Jesus affirmed only this — that whoever lives in God will be united to God; and he admitted no other idea of resurrection. As to personal resurrection, strange as it may appear to those who have never carefully studied the Gospels for themselves, Jesus said nothing about it whatever."—(*M. R.*, 144, Edition 1885.)

When we hear the denial of death we recognize it as the voice of Truth. It accords with our own inner belief that we cannot die; that the span of existence here cannot be all that there is of life. This inner conviction it is that makes us so gladly

accept the teaching that there is another life beyond this, where, with greater satisfaction, we shall continue the experiences begun in this. It has made us picture the other world as a place where material good and sensuous delights abound. We instinctively feel that there must be perfect happiness somewhere; and, as we have not attained it here, we shall surely get it elsewhere. Being blinded to the true life by our own false view, we extend our hopes, and try to calm our fears, by looking forward to a new life in the hereafter where we shall understand and enjoy.

And if even the animal man hears the voice of Truth, and responds to it so far as he can, how much more does the rational man recognize that voice. He knows he has life now, life that had no beginning with him, and shall not end with the destruction of his body; life whose fullness pervades every moment of his earthly existence, just as it will continue when he is no longer physically conscious.

"There is no Death," say all the great teachers of the world; and millions of men who understand life say the same, and bear witness to it with their lives. And every living man, whenever his soul sees clearly, feels the same truth in his heart. Not only he, but even they who would reduce life to a mechanism, who look upon one man as nothing

save as he contributes to the development of the race, which in turn is nothing, believe in the continuance of life. They say nothing ever dies. All is matter, and matter changes its form, but continues forever. They have found no death in Nature, for what is apparent death to one expression of Nature is but the vehicle of life to still another or to numerous expressions.

But men who do not understand life, who find it always a conflict in which the winner is no better off than the loser in the real things for which they strive, such men cannot do otherwise than fear death. For them the scientist's assurance of personal death carries with it dread and suffering. For if they have won what they sought here, and if they have known the spurious happiness possible to animal man, they hate to leave it and sink into nothingness; and if they have been unable to secure any happiness or contentment therefrom, they protest against annihilation, while still hungering and thirsting for the pleasures of life. They see death, and believe in it.

"How is there no death?" cry these people in wrath and indignation. "This is sophistry! Death is before us; it has mowed down millions, and will mow us down as well. And you may say as much as you please, that it does not exist, it will remain all the same. Yonder it is."

Argue it out: I shall die. What is there terrible about that? Death is merely a change, and how many changes have taken place, and are now in progress, in my fleshly existence, and I have not feared them? I am not even conscious of them. I do not live in fear to-day because the hair of my head, the nails on my fingers, the tissue of my interior physical organism or the very skin of my body will not be precisely the same to-morrow as now. I know that every time I think, speak or act, every time I draw a breath, I have caused a change in my organism. Shall I then fear to think, speak or act; shall I cease to breathe, simply because I cannot tell in advance just what that change may be, or because I desire that no change shall occur?

Why should I any more fear this change called Death, that has not yet come, and in which there is nothing repulsive to my reason and experience? It is comprehensible, familiar and natural to me, and during the whole course of my life I have formed fancies in which the death both of lower animals and of persons has been accepted by me, as a necessary and often an agreeable condition of life. If my physical comfort or pleasure is enhanced by the eating of meat, I do not protest against the violent deaths of the lower animals whose bodies I consume. Or, if my safety is

menaced by lower animals or by human beings, I do not object to the sentence of death being carried into effect. I view the intervention of custom and law in my behalf with complacency and satisfaction. If there is nothing terrible to me in the thought of death for these, what is there so terrible in the prospect of destruction for my physical body? There is nothing terrible in it but the loss of the things I regard as life.

For there are but two strictly logical ways of looking at life; one the false view — that by which life is understood as these seeming changes that take place in my body from my birth to my death; the other the true view — that by which life is understood as the unseen consciousness that is within myself. Both views are logical, and men may hold either the one or the other, though they cannot hold them both at the same time, and get either joy or satisfaction. But in neither, held by itself, is the fear of death consistent.

If the false view of life, that the animal life is all, were correct, then we should have no fear of death, for it is the natural end of the flesh. We see it happening on all sides, and should accept it without any conscious recognition of it at all, just as we accept all the other changes in the body. If we accept the true view we know that our conscious-

ness is separate from the physical body; that the changes in the body do not and cannot affect it, and that even the death of the body leaves the consciousness untouched.

CHAPTER XVIII

LIFE EVERLASTING

THE false view, which understands life as the visible changes in the body from birth to death, is as old as is the world itself. Men think they have recently discovered it, that only to modern scientists has it been revealed that all there is of life is contained in matter. Our materialistic philosophy, instead of discovering this view, has only carried it so far that it seems absurd. For no matter how far Science proceeds in this direction it comes always to the point where it has explained so much *about* Life that it becomes necessary to explain Life itself. And here it fails. It cannot show man how to live happily and how to bring about peace and harmony between the two apparently opposing wills within him. Failing, this, it fails in all, for this is all of life. Both in its teaching and in its failure materialism to-day is the materialism of all ages and races.

"I firmly believe that, a few centuries hence, the history of what we call the scientific activity of

this age will be a prolific subject for the hilarity and pity of future generations. For a number of centuries, they will say, the scholars of the western portion of a great continent were the victims of epidemic insanity; they imagined themselves to be the possessors of a life of eternal beatitude, and they busied themselves with divers lucubrations in which they sought to determine in what way this life could be realized without themselves doing anything or even concerning themselves with what they already had. And to the future historian it will seem more melancholy, that it will be found that this group of men once had a master who taught them a number of simple and clear rules, pointing out what they must do to render their lives happy — and that the words of this master had been construed by some to mean that he would come on a cloud to reorganize human society, and by others as admirable doctrine, but impracticable, since human life was not what they conceived it to be and, consequently, was not worthy of consideration; as to human reason (they thought), it must concern itself with the study of the laws of an imaginary existence, without concerning itself about the welfare of man."—(*M. R.*, 173.)

Materialism found expression among the Chinese and the Greeks ages before the modern discoveries were made. Among the Hebrews the thought ap-

pears in the Book of Job, the oldest of all their books: "Dust thou art, and to dust shalt thou return." This view as held at present may be thus expressed: "Life is a chance play of forces in matter, showing itself in space and time. Consciousness is the spark that flashes up from matter under certain conditions. All is the product of matter infinitely varied; and what is called life is only a certain condition of dead matter."

Such is one way of looking at life. This view is utterly false and unsatisfying. It confuses life with its exact opposite — dead matter. It leaves man nothing to build upon, nothing that explains his existence or shows any excuse or purpose for his development. If life be but "a chance play of forces in matter," this play may at any moment cease, and life will then become extinct. It is a contradiction of the axiom that a stream cannot rise higher than its source, when we attribute the graces of the spiritual man to such a source of life as dead matter. But to those who have arrived at such a conclusion, death should not be terrible, but life ought to be terrible, as something unnatural and senseless. And life does appear so to the Buddhists, and to the modern pessimists, like Schopenhauer and Hartman.

The other view of life is as follows: Life is only what I recognize in myself, when I meditate

upon it. I am always conscious of my life, not as I have been or as I shall be, but I am conscious of my life thus — that I am, that I never began anywhere, that I shall never end anywhere. It is not possible for me or for any individual to conceive of the state where this " I " that I recognize, did not exist. When I begin to think of this at all, I feel that I am as old as recorded Time, and older, and though I may conceive, and do conceive, of my body as recent and as undergoing changes, yet this does not affect the " I."

Nor can I conceive of this " I " being blotted out and destroyed. I feel that there is no more an end for the real man than there was a beginning; none the less so, because I see the decay of the body. And, according to this understanding of life, death does not exist.

Neither as an animal only, nor as a rational being only, can a man fear death. The animal is not conscious of life, but merely fulfills its functions, satisfying its animal needs from day to day. It feels pain, but does not see death ahead as its final experience. Not conceiving of life, it cannot conceive of death. The rational being, having a consciousness of life, cannot see in death anything except a natural and never-ending change of matter. Only that being which, though endowed with reason, yet sees only animal desires as the source

and purpose of life, fears death, for to him it is neither natural nor reasonable.

Man fears, not death that he does not know; but he fears life, that is, his animal existence with its changes, that he does know. He fears the loss of it, for, knowing naught else, to lose it is to lose all. The feeling expressed in men by the fear of death, is only the consciousness of the inward contradiction of life; just as the fear of ghosts is merely the feeling of a deluded mind.

There is, of course, a merely physical shrinking from death, due to the inheritance of a desire to avoid it. Like the impulse to reproduction, this has been strengthened out of all proportion to other desires, because those men or beasts in which this desire was strongest were incited to the greatest exertions to avoid death. Before the days when man's reason had taught him how to protect himself from the elemental forces of Nature; before he knew the arts of peace and the helpfulness of association, life as he then knew it, the animal life, was maintained only through the greatest effort, and only those that reproduced abundantly were able to continue and to develop their kind from generation to generation. But reproduction alone was not enough, and man came to recognize that the next means for combating forces that he did not understand must be the development of strength

and cunning to withstand those forces. This proved to be even more effective than abundant progeny, and accordingly races developing these characteristics not only succeeded in great measure in perpetuating themselves, and increasing their number, but also they endowed their offspring with the same race-feelings.

On the other hand, those that had little repulsion to death submitted earlier to any adverse conditions, and so earlier ceased to multiply offspring. Even the descendants they left surrendered easily in the struggle for existence, thereby cutting off such branches of the family. In this way a repulsion to death became a means to life, and this animal repulsion still remains with men.

But the momentary physical shrinking from death which is the inheritance of man from his struggling ancestors, is not what tortures men, making them think of "a grim specter," "a destroyer," and so on and so forth.

Superstitious fear of death is not fear of death at all, but fear of a life after the throes of death, a life as unsatisfactory as this. Our conception of this life is disappointing and unreasonable, and we imagine the life after death to be as unreasonable and inconsistent with the nature of Man and of God as we have made this present life to be. When we picture a life after this, it is this life

over again, only a little less gross. We realize how futile has been our search for happiness here, while enthralled by personal pleasures, and we cannot see wherein we can hope for more in the life to come. "This is bad enough," we say, "but at least I know what it is. Of the hereafter I know nothing."

"I shall cease to be, I shall die, all that in which I set my life will die," says one voice within man.

"I am," says another voice, "and I cannot die, and I ought not to die. I ought not to die, and I am dying." It is thus that the animal man whose reason is not fully awakened feels the contradiction of his life.

CHAPTER XIX

THE TERROR FROM IGNORANCE

Not in death, but in this contradiction within him lies the cause of the terror that seizes a man at the thought of the death of the flesh. This fear of death lies not in the fact that man dreads the end of his animal existence, but in the fact that it seems to him that that which cannot die and must not die, will die. He cannot understand this catastrophe, so its approach fills him with dread. Man fears anything that he does not understand; this is a race-inheritance from those days before reason ruled and interpreted things aright. Primitive man approached all new things, or things beyond his experience with fear, if he approached them at all. This fear developed caution, which in turn served to lengthen his bodily existence. Mankind has not yet outgrown the fears of primitive man.

But we are terrified by the thought of the death of the flesh, not because we are afraid that life will end with it, but because the death of the flesh plainly demonstrates to us the necessity of a true life which we do not possess, but which we feel we

should possess and should have enjoyed. We know that the unsatisfactory result of our pleasure-seeking is itself a contradiction of life, as we feel that life should be. We surmise that somehow we have missed our aim, and we dread losing the opportunity to try again.

This fear of death proceeds from the fear of losing our special self which, we feel, constitutes our life. We think, " I shall die, my body will molder, and destroy myself." That which we have built up through the gratification of the senses, this bundle of hopes and fears, likes and dislikes, whims and prejudices; this something that causes us to seek and strive for success, this is what we think of as " Myself." We prize this self of ours; and, assuming that this self is the same as our fleshly life — as it would be were our understanding of what is " Myself " correct — we conclude that we must be annihilated with the destruction of our fleshly life.

But my real self is not my body, but rather that which has lived in my body for so many years. Neither my body, nor the length of its existence in any way determines the life of the soul. We all know that, even before we submit ourselves to the control of the higher reason. Any man living purely on the animal plane, knows that he, himself, is no less if he loses an arm or a leg. His

body has suffered a loss, but there is no lessening of that which animates the body. He does not think of himself as by so much less a human being. He knows that the bodily manifestation has nothing to do with his real self. If I, every moment of my life, ask myself in my own mind "What am I?," I reply: "Something thinking and feeling," that is, bearing itself to the world in its own peculiar fashion.

But this self, which thinks and feels, had its origin, and began to take its character, thousands of years ago in my ancestors, and in that from which they sprang. As a result it has its tendencies which are being modified by the experience and development of every day, but which have not yet broken free from the traits my ancestors gave it. This self is continuous; it began before my body was formed, and cannot then be a mere part of the body, which will end with it or change with it. It is something separate from the body; something that uses the body as an instrument to express itself so long as it needs that sort of expression, or so long as this particular body can serve its needs, but its beginning or continuance is not dependent upon the body. "I never was not, nor shall I hereafter cease to be." (*Bhagavad Gita.*)

Our body is not one, changeless and unchange-

able, but is steadily undergoing such complete changes that every few years finds us with an entirely new body; even the mind that supposes this changing body to be oneself, and to be always the same, is not itself continuous, but is merely a series of states of consciousness.

We have already many times lost both body and consciousness. Not only do we undergo every few years a loss of the body that we knew and that we thought to be ours, but also we lose our consciousness every time we fall asleep. Every day and hour we feel in ourselves the alteration of this consciousness, and we do not fear it in the least. We hear of something that is to occur, and our feeling about it is dread: we go around with a vague consciousness of discomfort about this thing. When it comes, we find perhaps that it has proved both a pleasurable and profitable experience for us, then our consciousness toward it changes completely, yet this change brings us no terror. We accept such changes of our consciousness constantly, and either give no thought to them or are glad of them.

Hence, if there is any such thing as our "self," a consciousness that we are afraid of losing at death, then that self cannot be part and parcel of the body that we call ours. If it were a part of that body it would not be continuous, but, like the body, subject to constant change.

What is this something that binds in one all the states of consciousness that proceed in it, and succeed one another hour by hour, but that fundamental *Self?* What is this on which as on a cord, are strung one after the other our various, succeeding states of consciousness, day by day? This is our real self, that which says, "I love this, and I don't love that."

In this attitude to other beings, every being is separate. It is impossible to group any number of human beings by marks or physical manifestations only, when we come to know them. And this is true not only of man. If I know a horse, a dog and a cow, and have any intelligent relations with them, I know them not alone by their external marks, but by that peculiar relation to the world in which each one of them stands, by the fact that each one of them, and in its degree, likes and dislikes, loves and does not love this or that.

This peculiar property of beings, of loving some things in a greater or less degree, and not loving others, is usually called character, and man's character is in reality merely the sum of his understanding of life and his relation to it. The character is admirable and lovable according to the extent of the man's true understanding of life.

CHAPTER XX

SPIRITUAL LIFE

THE idea that the life consists neither of the perceptions of body only nor of those of mind only nor of the perception of body and mind combined is becoming familiar to us, through the teaching of "Mental Scientists," as well as through the new interest in the doctrines of Buddha and of Theosophy. Neither "mental" nor "Christian" Science nor Theosophy claims to be new, but only to be the distinct enunciation of great and world-old truths. Truth is never new, but has existed ever since time was, although not generally recognized by men. Wherever any great Teacher of ethics stands out from any age or race, it is always because he has seen the same fundamental Truth, though he may present it in somewhat different form. This Truth has been from the foundation of the world, and must continue. The first truth discovered about the laws governing the material world ages ago, and upon which all modern discovery is based, is as true now as when rudely expressed by primitive man.

The same continuity holds with spiritual laws. The truths recognized centuries ago are not less truths to-day; consequently the modern teachers refer to the oldest sacred books for statements of the transcendent nature of man.

The reason that men generally do not see the truth in regard to life is that they fix their eyes upon a small, insignificant bit of life, and base their conclusions upon that, just as once astronomers, regarding the tiny planet that we call the Earth as the center of the solar system, interpreted everything in accordance with that belief. It was only the exceptional astronomer, who, seeking truth rather than verification of prejudice, helped to emancipate men from false views of the "glories of the heavens." Men were not willing to be emancipated, and feared lest the revelations of solar laws should bring disaster upon them and their tiny planet. So men do not wish to see all of life, and tremble lest this tiny fragment of it that is so dear to them should be lost. The imaginary danger to an existence which they totally misunderstand becomes a real terror. It takes possession of their consciousness, and precludes the possibility of recognizing their true life and all it holds. This recalls the story of the madman who imagined that he was made of glass, and being obsessed with this false idea, when he was thrown

down, cried "Smash!" and immediately died. There is no more foundation in fact for the false view of life which causes suffering and terror, than there was for the false view that caused the madman's death.

One who has entered into the knowledge of life knows that this love for some, and dislike for others, which has been brought into his existence by himself, is the essence of his life; that this is not an accidental property of life, but that this alone has the essential of life, and he places his life only in this essential, the growth of love.

As his love grows, his life expands, and his dislikes are superseded by understanding, which contains no element of pain. He sees that his relation to the world has changed, that his submission to the law of reason has increased. He notes the growing strength and scope of his love which gives him more and more happiness, not only independently of his personal existence, but sometimes directly contrary to it, increasing in proportion to the decrease of separate existence. This is foolishness to the animal man, but the rational man knows its truth.

Such a man, having received his life from a past that is invisible to him, perceives its constant and unbroken growth that has nothing to do with his body, and he transfers it not only calmly but joy-

fully to the unseen future. Death of the body holds no terrors for him; he knows it cannot affect his true life, which must continue as it has always continued.

Reflecting upon this I see that my friend, or my brother, has lived precisely like myself, but he has ceased to live as I live through a bodily existence. His life has been his consciousness and it has been passed in a bodily existence. My brother has been; I have had relation with him, and now he is not, and I do not know the place, if there is any place, where he is.

"He is gone, nothing has been left behind," cries the animal man. Thus would speak a chrysalis, a cocoon that had not yet released the butterfly, on seeing that a cocoon lying beside it has been left empty.

The cocoon might reasonably say this, if it could think and speak because, on losing its neighbor, it would, in reality, no longer feel it in any way. It is not thus with man. My brother has died; his cocoon, it is true, has been left empty. I do not see him in the form in which I used to see him, but the fact that he has disappeared from my physical sight has not destroyed my relations with him. I retain, as the expression goes, a "remembrance" of him.

This remembrance is not only of his physical

body — the cocoon which held his spirit — his hands, his face, his eyes, but also a remembrance of his spiritual form. His likes and dislikes, his hopes and aims, his understanding of life also remain with me. The forms of crystals and animals disappear; so far as we know, no remembrance of them remains among crystals, or even among the lower animals. But the recollection I have of my brother is something vital; it acts upon me, and acts precisely as the life of my brother acted during his earthly existence. This remembrance demands of me now, after his death, what it demanded of me during his lifetime. I cannot deny his life, because I am conscious of its power upon me. I feel constrained to think certain thoughts or perform certain acts, as the result of this power, just as faithfully as I would perform them were my brother still here asking these things of my love for him. I may no longer see how he holds me, but I feel in all my being that he still holds me as before, and hence that he exists. This is the natural thought of men.

Maeterlinck brings it out in his symbolical drama, *The Bluebird,* when in the "Land of Memory" the children learn that the beloved live as long as they are remembered or their influence is felt.

CHAPTER XXI

THE REAL LIFE

Recognizing this fact of the continuance of those who have lived, Henry George said at the funeral of his co-worker, Croasdale:

"But that which we instinctively feel as more than matter and more than energy: that which in thinking of our friend to-day we cherish as best and highest — that cannot be lost. If there be in the world order and purpose, that still lives."

Jesus died a long time ago. His existence in the flesh was brief. We have no clear idea of his person; but the power of his wise and loving life, his attitude toward the world, and nothing else, acts to the present day upon millions who take his mental attitude to themselves and live according to it. The centuries have not lessened but rather increased his power. It is acknowledged not only by individuals and groups, but by whole races and peoples. "I believe that nothing but the fulfillment of the doctrine of Jesus can give true happiness to men. I believe that the fulfillment of this doctrine is possible, easy, and pleasant. I believe

that although none other should follow this doctrine, and I alone were left to practice it, I cannot refuse to obey it. . . . I believe that my life according to the doctrine of the world has been a torment, and that a life according to the doctrine of Jesus can alone give me in this world the happiness for which I was destined by the Father of Life."—(*M. R.*, 265.) Nations are deemed civilized according to their acceptance or rejection of the power of Jesus' life, the life of a poor man devoid of material possessions, but rich in love. What is it that acts thus? What is it that was formerly bound up with the existence of Jesus in the flesh, and that constitutes the continuation and the growth of this life of his? Men have long sought some explanation of it that shall better fit with material ideas, but none is forthcoming. We cannot escape the conclusion that the power is his *life* that so acts. We may say that it is not the life of Jesus, but its results. And, having said these words, utterly destitute of meaning, we deceive ourselves into thinking that we have said something clearer and more definite than that this power is the living Jesus himself.

Surely this is the way that ants might talk while clustered about an acorn that has grown up and become an oak. The oak tears up the soil with its roots, produces branches, leaves, and new

acorns; it screens from the light and the rain, and changes everything that formerly grew around it. "This is not the life of the acorn," say the ants, "but the results of its life, which came to an end when we dragged off the acorn, and buried it in the ground." This problem of the death of the flesh troubled those who shared the time of Jesus' short bodily existence, just as it troubles men today. He tried to teach them by parable, the only way he could make it clear to them, and by reference to the laws of life governing their material world. He reminded them that a grain of corn put in the ground must first "die," as we call the transition, ere it produce life and fulfill the purpose of its existence. Every man who fulfills the law of life, submitting his animal personality to his reason, and to the manifestation of the power of love, has lived and, after the disappearance of his corporeal existence, will live through others with whom he is one.

In order to save themselves from fear of death, some men try to assure themselves that the animal existence is their rational existence, and that the immortality of the animal race of men satisfies the demand for immortality that they bear within them. But they can realize immortality only by comprehending that real life is that eternal movement that in this life seems but as a wave. "As

the swallow darting through thy halls," said the heathen philosopher, " such, O King, is the life of man."

The great change in our position at the death of the body is terrible to us. We feel that we cannot understand how this thing may be, and that it must be evil. We ask, " When this thinking, feeling ' I ' is cut off from the body through which it seems to express thought, feeling and action, what is to become of it? " How shall one know " himself " when this has happened? It is, indeed, a terrible change, because it is so great a change.

But we forget that the same great change took place at our birth, and nothing evil came of it. On the contrary, so good a thing came of it that we do not wish to part with it at all. We wish to retain our visible life, forgetting that it is but a part of the endless movement of life.

However contracted may have been the sphere of man's activity, whether he be Jesus or Socrates, a woman, an obscure, self-sacrificing old man, or a mere youth, if he lives renouncing his personality for the happiness of others, he has already entered here, in this life, upon that new relation to the world that is the real business of mankind.

Our true life exists; we know it only; from it we know the animal life, and we know that this

semblance of life is subject to unchangeable laws. We see this on every hand in the material or visible world and we accept it, feeling more secure because of the immutable nature of the laws governing all that happens in this visible life. Why should not what happens in the invisible life itself also be subject to laws, and to the results of those laws?

To complain because I cannot now understand much that happened before my present visible life, and that which will take place after my death, is like complaining because I cannot see what is beyond the limits of my eyesight. Is not all the "mystery of life" like the mystery of the forest, ominous and dark, both in front of us and behind, but light enough for each one where he is? In truth, "the mystery of life" seems to consist in trying to see behind things up to which we have not yet come.

"But," persists the troubled consciousness, "though I cease to fear death for myself, it takes my wife, my child, my friends; this loss I cannot but feel, and I miss them sorely. That is a grief. How is it possible I should not fear that?"

Such grief, however, is but a refined form of selfishness. The remembrance, the influence, in short the "spirit" of our dear ones is still with us, and still moves our thoughts and desires. It

is but our individual gratification that we miss and lament.

"That may be so," replies the erring consciousness again, "but it is the gratification of our noblest part, the affection; such gratification feeds the very love of which you talk."

"True," answers the higher reason, "but in love for all, and in self-sacrifice on their behalf, instead of in gratification by their means, those affections will find a larger field. In that larger love is happiness instead of regret."

And the narrower our love, the more pain we suffer from it; the largest love embraces, understands and forgives everything, and knows no disappointments, and no end.

CHAPTER XXII

THE USE OF PAIN

THE inexplicability of the sufferings of the earthly existence proves to man more clearly than anything else could prove it that his life is not a mere personality that began at his birth, and ends at his death, since there could be no justification for the pain and disappointment he endures, if there were no more to life than the brief span of his bodily existence, nor could there be any explanation, which would not be fraught with horror, of some experiences that men endure.

Wolves rend a man alone in the forest, or a man is drowned, frozen, or burned to death, or simply falls ill alone and dies, and no one ever knows how he suffered. There are thousands of such cases. Of what use, we ask, can this suffering be to anyone?

For the man who understands his life as an animal existence there is not, and cannot be, any answer to this question, because for such a man the bond between suffering and error, with its cause and significance and teaching, lies only in what is

visible to him, and this bond is lost to his mental vision in the sufferings that precede death.

To such a man suffering is torture; he looks upon it as something he must endure because he is helpless to evade it, but he sees no sense in it, no necessity for it. The animal man either rebels or simply endures. But in the natural order, suffering is only a sensation that spurs to activity; the activity in turn banishes this painful sensation, and calls forth a state of pleasure. If the suffering be our own physical or mental sensation, the pain is relieved by any effort on our part to relieve it, for this concentrates the attention upon the thing we are trying to do, and to that extent withdraws conscious attention from the pain itself. As the intensity of any suffering depends in large measure upon the degree of conscious recognition it wins from us, the decrease of attention decreases the pain; and as all pleasure is induced by the activity of man's body or mind, so the effort to help ourselves excites a pleasurable interest in what we are doing, and still further lessens the pain. The invalid is to be the more pitied the more persons he has to wait upon him, to move him, and to anticipate his every desire — for all these persons deprive him of the activity which would dull the pain. Often such an invalid unreasonably but instinctively resents the attentions.

This relief is even more marked where the suffering is another's, especially a well-loved person's pain. We almost lose sight of his pain, and totally lose our own, if we are able to do something for him to relieve the suffering. It is when inaction rules that we suffer most keenly; but naturally suffering induces effort to relieve itself. Suffering, therefore, is that which preserves and moves life, and hence it is what should be; then for what does man inquire when he asks: "Why, and to what end is suffering?" The beasts do not ask this. When the perch, in consequence of hunger, torments the dace, when the spider tortures the fly, or the wolf devours the sheep, each is doing what must be, and each is accomplishing the thing that must be done; likewise, therefore, when the perch, the spider or the wolf fall into like torments from stronger animals, they resist, wrench themselves away and flee, but they accept what they are doing as part of the inevitable. In them there cannot be a question that what is happening to them is what must happen in the course of Nature.

"I remember once, when a bear attacked me and pressed me down under him, driving the claws of his enormous paw into my shoulder, I felt no pain. I lay under him and looked into his warm, large mouth, with its wet, white teeth. He breathed above me, and I saw how he turned his

head to get into position to bite into both my temples at once; and in his hurry, or from excited appetite, he made a trial snap in the air just above my head, and again opened his mouth — that red, wet, hungry mouth, dripping with saliva. I felt I was about to die, and looked into the depths of that mouth, as one condemned to execution looks into the grave dug for him. I looked, and I remember that I felt no fear or dread. I saw with one eye, beyond the outline of that mouth, a patch of blue sky gleaming between purple clouds roughly piled on one another, and I thought how lovely it was up there. . . .

"I often remembered that moment afterwards; and now whenever I think of death, I picture that situation to myself, because I have never been nearer to death than then. I recall it, reflect on it, make comparisons, and see that death — real, serious and all-absorbing death — is, thank God, not dreadful. Everything becomes torpid then, and all that causes fear ceases to growl above one's head, and one's soul is easy and at peace.

"Probably the lamb crunched by a wolf, the bird in the serpent's mouth, travelers attacked in a forest, and men from under whose feet the hangman pushes the stool, feel the same."—(Maude's *Life of Tolstoy,* 74–5.)

(Livingston, in his *Travels,* testifies to exactly

similar feelings when he was knocked down and terribly bitten in the shoulder by a lion.—Ed.)

The depression and horror of death that seem to affect animals at the shambles, may well be due to their unnatural subjection to the power of pitiless intelligence. It is not natural to them to stand and await death; in their wild state they flee from danger until forced to face it; then, even gentle animals will turn upon the enemy, and defend themselves. At the shambles they are not able to follow nature's way — Man, not by strength, but by intelligence, controls them, and sends them to death to gratify his tastes. Something of this unnatural condition affects them, and they fear this power that controls them. Such fear Caliban might reasonably have of Setebos.

I perceive the cause of my suffering to lie in my errors in the past, and in the errors of other persons. If my efforts are not directed to the cause of suffering — to those errors — and if I do not try to free myself from them, I neglect that which should be done, just as, if a man had a thorn in his foot which gave him pain, and caused the leg to swell, he could not get rid of the suffering by treating the swelling only, while allowing the thorn to remain. If we do not remove the cause of the suffering, suffering presents itself in a way in which it should not, and not only is it increased

in imagination, but it grows also in fact to frightful proportions that exclude all possibility of normal life.

The cause of suffering to the animal is the violation of the law of animal life. While we live in harmony with the laws governing our physical or animal life, we suffer no physical pain, but violation of these laws makes itself known by pain. The disturbance that this violation causes in the whole body is directed to the removal of the cause of the pain. What we regard as cruel torture, not connecting cause and effect, is in reality a beneficent provision whereby we learn that by pursuing our present course we are violating some law that governs our well-being. If we could violate these laws with impunity, we might destroy the body before it had had an opportunity to express the purposes of the spirit dwelling in it.

The cause of suffering to rational consciousness is also found in a violation of law, and makes itself known as "sin." It is this violation of law that leads to unhappiness and misery — the disturbance throughout the whole rational consciousness — and this disturbance is really directed to the removal of the cause of the suffering — the "sin."

"Sickness, weakness, and death play a necessary and beneficent part in our spiritual progress."— (*M. L.*, 43.)

CHAPTER XXIII

THE BALM FOR SUFFERING

As animal suffering induces activity looking toward the removal of pain, and this activity alleviates the pain, so the sufferings of a rational being induce activity directed toward removing the error — the ill-doing on our part which has caused the suffering. This activity, this effort to undo the wrong, itself helps to free suffering from its horrors. All men know in the depths of their own souls that suffering is indispensable to the happiness of their lives; for happiness is a conscious state, and depends largely upon the activity of the individual: it is the harmony which arises from living in accordance with the higher law. If there were no suffering for violation of law, there would be no happiness from living in accord with law. So men go on living, foreseeing suffering, or submitting to it. Their rebellion against suffering is due to their false view of life, which demands happiness for their personality only; this makes any interference with personal happiness seem unnatural and, therefore, disturbing.

Pain in the brute and in the child is well defined and slight in intensity, never attaining to that anguish that it reaches in beings endowed with rational consciousness. (As Olive Schreiner says, "By every inch we grow [mentally], our capacity for suffering increases."— ED.)

In the being highly developed mentally and nervously, with the higher consciousness still unawakened, the capacity for suffering is frequently so intense that the brain breaks down organically from the strain, or, at best, the anguish is almost unendurable, and words are not adequate to express it. In the case of a child, it sometimes cries as piteously from the sting of a wasp, as from an injury that destroys the vital organs.

In a being that does not reason, not only is the intensity of suffering less at the time, but also pain leaves little trace in the memory. Let anyone endeavor to recall his childish sufferings from pain and he will see that he is incapable of reconstructing them in imagination. If we suffer pain from the recollection of childish experiences, it is less from any trace of suffering left in our memory than from our unconscious attribution of our present capacity for suffering to our childish selves and the building up of a new mental picture, rather than the reconstruction of the old.[1] The impres-

[1] There may be exceptions to this rule in the case of

sion made on us by the sight of the suffering of children and of brutes is really more our suffering than theirs.

Before the rational consciousness has been awakened, pain serves only as a protection to the person, and is not acute. Its intensity is greatly lessened, even to the developed mind, if some special emotion not connected with the pain dominates the consciousness. Not to mention the martyrs, not to mention the troops of men, who, like Huss, sang in the fire at the stake, simple men, merely out of a desire to exhibit courage, will endure without a cry or a quiver, what are considered the most torturing of operations. There are limits to pain, but to the lessening of sensation under pain, there is no limit. That lessening rests with the reasonableness of the development.

For persons who think their life lies in the existence of the flesh the anguish of pain is frightful. Yet it is true, that had we been created without the feeling of pain, we should soon have begun to beg for it; for women, free from the pains of childbirth, would have brought forth children under conditions where hardly any would have remained

children over-stimulated, or abnormally developed nervously and mentally through too close association with adults who live chiefly in their emotions, but it holds good in normal children in normal surroundings.— (Ed.)

alive;[1] children and young people would have spoiled their bodies, and grown people would have known neither the errors of those who had lived before them, nor, what is most important of all, their own errors. In this life, had there been no pain, men would have had no rational object of existence, for they would not have known what they must do: they could never have reconciled themselves to the idea of impending death in the flesh, and they would not have known love, because they would have lacked opportunity for its unselfish exercise.

And just as, were there no physical pain, man would have no indication when he transgresses the laws of nature: so if rational consciousness suffered no pain, man would not know the law, that is to say, would not know the Truth.

"Ah," someone may retort, "you are talking about your personal sufferings, but how can you ignore the sufferings of others? The sight of these sufferings constitutes the most active suffering in the observer." This they say not in full sincerity, though they may not be conscious of in-

[1] Even now our social and economic conditions are so bad that it is estimated that two out of four or five born die before reaching the age of five years. It is only our horror at such tragedies that slowly induces us to try to improve social conditions.— (ED.)

sincerity. For sympathy which is aroused in us by the sight or knowledge of suffering, is really a healthful and natural emotion. If we do nothing in response to this emotion we create a morbid state of mind which is detrimental to health and development. This is common among readers of sensational novels who have their feelings stirred by the conditions and sufferings of imaginary beings portrayed so graphically by the novelist, yet who do not guide their emotions into any channel of activity for the betterment of actual conditions. If, however, we bend every energy, and exert every power to relieve the suffering that appeals to us, sympathy with it ceases to be a pain. We feel even a pleasure in our activity, and in its partial success in relieving the suffering, and yet more in remedying the evil that causes it. Above all, we find that it calls forth in ourselves, as well as in others, the feeling of Love.

Activity directed to the immediate, loving service of the suffering and to the diminution of error, which is the general cause of suffering, is the only joyful labor that lies before man, and gives him that happiness in which life consists.

No claim of novelty is made for this teaching. It is that of Christianity — of the Christianity of the Sermon on the Mount, as distinguished from that of the Council of Nicea. It virtually says to

us: "Renounce your selfish ends; love all men, all creatures, and devote your life to them. You will then be conscious of possessing the joy of the Spirit and conscious of true life, which is eternal, and to you there will be no death."

The sum of the matter is this: The life of man is a striving after happiness, and that for which he strives is given to enlightened man.

Evil, in the form of suffering and death, is visible to man only when he takes the law of his corporeal animal existence for the law of his inner life. Only when he, being a man, redescends to the level of the beast, does he even see death and suffering.

Happiness is to be found in the service of our fellow creatures, through which service we come to be one with the mind of the Universe. It does not depend upon what success we may see in this service. The effort to remove the causes of the sufferings of others, and especially to enable them to think rightly, so that they may themselves avoid evil, is in itself a joy.

Death and suffering are only crimes committed by man against the law of life in himself or in others. For a man who lives according to his law, there is no death and no suffering.

"O death, where is thy sting?
O grave, where is thy victory?"

PART II

ON ACTION

THE remainder of this volume consists of citations from Tolstoy. As explained in the Introduction, all the following are the very words of Tolstoy, except for an occasional connecting sentence which is plainly indicated. The translations, mostly taken from *My Confession, My Religion, What is Art?* and *What to Do,* after comparison where possible with the original or with French versions, from T. Y. Crowell & Co.'s editions, the right of reproduction having been purchased, and from Aylmer Maude's translations, mostly in his *Life of Tolstoy* (Dodd, Mead & Co.). Probably it will surprise many persons to see how they reinforce, amplify and carry to their logical conclusions, the doctrines laid down in the book *On Life,* the summary of which forms the first part of this book.

The essence of Tolstoy's interpretation of practical life, his creed, if he may be said to have had a creed, is succinctly set out in this part; it is mostly quoted from Maude because "It was approved by Tolstoy himself, so that one is sure it represents his meaning correctly."—(Maude's *Life of Tolstoy,* 32. Also Preface to v. II., p. v.)

CHAPTER I

PROBLEMS

I MIGHT have understood how absurd it was of me, while educating my own children in complete idleness and luxury, to hope to correct other people and their children, who were perishing from idleness in what I called the Rzhánof den: (a large Municipal Lodging House.—ED.) where three-fourths of the people work for themselves and for others. But I understood nothing of all that.—(*M. L.*, 134.)

Everything now being done in Russia is done in the name of the general welfare, in the name of the protection and tranquillity of the inhabitants of Russia. And if this is so, then it is also all done for me, who live in Russia. For me, therefore, exists the destitution of the people, deprived of the first, most natural right of man — the right to use the land on which he is born; for me the half-million men torn away from wholesome peasant life and dressed in uniforms and taught to kill; for me that false so-called priesthood, whose chief duty it is to pervert and conceal true Christianity;

for me all these transportations of men from place to place; for me these hundreds of thousands of hungry workmen wandering about Russia; for me these hundreds of thousands of unfortunates dying of typhus and scurvy in the fortresses and prisons which do not suffice for such a multitude; for me the mothers, wives and fathers of the exiles, the prisoners, and those who are hanged, are suffering; for me these dozens and hundreds of men have been shot; for me the horrible work goes on of these hangmen, at first enlisted with difficulty, but who now no longer so loathe their work; for me exist these gallows, and well-soaped cords from which hang women, children and peasants; for me exists this terrible embitterment of man against his fellow-man.

Strange as is the statement that all this is done for me, and that I am a participator in these terrible deeds, I cannot but feel that there is an indubitable interdependence between my spacious room, my dinner, my clothing, my leisure, and these terrible crimes committed to get rid of those who would like to take from me what I use. And though I know that these homeless, embittered, depraved people — who but for the Government's threats would deprive me of all I am using — are products of that same Government's actions, still I cannot help feeling that, at present, my peace

really is dependent on all the horrors that are now being perpetrated by the Government.

And being conscious of this, I can no longer endure it, but must free myself from this intolerable position! It is impossible to live so! I, at any rate, cannot and will not live so.—(*M. L.*, 634, 635.)

As to the relation, I do not say of a Christian, but simply of a reasonable man to taxation there can be no question — as with all demands to participate in governmental crimes, a Christian cannot fail to try to free himself from such participation.—(*M. L.*, 570.)

"The powers that be are ordained by God," says Paul. Which powers? Those of Pougatchef (The rebel leader who for a while held the Volga Provinces under his sway.— ED.) or those of Catherine II?—(*M. L.*, 41.)

I believe in this: I believe in God, whom I understand as Spirit, as Love, as the Source of all. I believe that He is in me and I in Him. I believe that the will of God is most clearly and intelligibly expressed in the teaching of the man Jesus, to consider, and pray to whom, as God, I esteem the greatest blasphemy. I believe that man's true welfare lies in fulfilling God's will, and His will is that men should love one another, and should consequently do to others as they wish

others to do to them — of which it is said in the Gospels that in this is the law and the prophets. I believe, therefore, that the meaning of the life of every man is to be found only in increasing the love that is in him; that this increase of love leads man, even in this life, to ever greater and greater blessedness, and after death gives him the more blessedness the more love he has, and helps more than anything else towards the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth: that is, to the establishment of an order of life in which the discord, deception, and violence that now rule will be replaced by free accord, by truth, and by the brotherly love of one for another. I believe that to obtain progress in love there is only one means, prayer — not public prayer in churches, plainly forbidden by Jesus, but private prayer, like the sample given us by Jesus, consisting of the renewing and strengthening, in our own consciousness, of the meaning of our life and of our complete dependence on the will of God.— (*M. L.*, 580.)

I deny the incomprehensible Trinity; the fable, which is altogether meaningless in our time, of the fall of the first man; the blasphemous story of a God born of a Virgin to redeem the human race. But God, a Spirit; God, love; the only God — the Source of all — I not only do not deny, but I attribute real existence to God alone, and I see the

whole meaning of life only in fulfilling His Will, which is expressed in the Christian teaching.—(*M. L.*, 579.)

If one is to understand, by life beyond the grave, the Second Advent, a hell with eternal torments, devils, and a Paradise of perpetual happiness — it is perfectly true that I do not acknowledge such a life beyond the grave; but eternal life and retribution here and everywhere, now and for ever, I acknowledge to such an extent that, standing now, at my age, on the verge of my grave, I often have to make an effort to restrain myself from desiring the death of this body — that is, the birth of a new life; and I believe every good action increases the true welfare of my eternal life, and every evil action decreases it.—(*Answer to the Decree of the Synod.*)

No religion has ever preached things so evidently incompatible with reason and with contemporary knowledge, or so immoral, as the doctrines preached by Church-Christianity. Not to speak of all the absurdities of the Old Testament, such as the creation of light before the sun, the creation of the world 6,000 years ago, the housing of all the animals in the Ark; or of the many immoral horrors, such as injunctions to massacre children and whole populations at God's command; . . . not to dwell on all that, what can be more ab-

surd than that the Mother of God was both a mother and a virgin; that the sky opened and a voice spoke from up there; that Christ flew into the sky and sits somewhere at the right hand of his Father; or that God is both One and Three, not three Gods like Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva, but One and yet Three? And what can be more immoral than the terrible doctrine that an angry and revengeful God punishes all men for Adam's sin, and sent His son to earth to save them, knowing beforehand that men would kill him and would therefore be damned, and that salvation from sin depends on being baptized; or in believing that all these things really happened, and that the son of God was killed by men that men might be saved, and that God will punish with eternal torments those who do not believe this? —(*M. L.*, 599.)

" It is very well argued that Christ never existed, the probability is as strong against as for it. . . . The moral teaching of goodness . . . flows not from any one source in time or space, but from the whole spiritual life of humanity in its entirety."—(*M. L.*, 56.)

In the New Testament, Tolstoy frankly dislikes and disapproves of much in the Epistles of Paul, whom he accuses of having given a fatal bias to Christianity, which enabled the Church to ally itself with the State, and prevented the majority of

men from understanding what Jesus meant. Paul's mind was of an administrative, organizing type, foreign and repugnant to Tolstoy's anarchistic nature, which instinctively resents anything that, aiming at practical results, tolerates imperfect institutions.—(*M. L.*, 41.)

Here are the five Commandments of Christ; an attempt to follow them would alter our whole society.

"I found in the Gospels an explanation of the meaning of life that perfectly satisfied, one higher than anything I had known or could imagine."—(*S. C. T.*, 152.)

1. Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: but I say unto you, that every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment. (Do not be angry.)

2. Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, that every one that looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart. The second great rule of conduct is: (Do not lust.)

3. Again, ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths:

but I say unto you, Swear not at all. . . . But let your speech be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay. (Do not give away the control of your future actions.)

4. Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, *Resist not him that is evil;* but whoso smites thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.

5. Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy: but I say unto you, Love your enemies . . . that ye may be sons of your Father which is in Heaven; for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust. For if ye love them that love you . . . What do ye more than others? Do not even the Gentiles (foreigners, Germans, etc.) the same? Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.—(*M. L.*, 33–7.)

CHAPTER II

RELIGION

"WHEN Count Tolstoy speaks of the Church and its dogmas, he refers especially, of course, to the Orthodox Greek Church, the national Church of Russia." (Translator's note to *M. R.*, Appendix, Ed. 1885, p. 1.)

The First commandment of Jesus tells us to be at peace with everyone and to consider none as foolish or unworthy. If peace is violated, we are to seek to reëstablish it. The true religion is in the extinction of enmity among men. We are to be reconciled without delay, that we may not lose that inner peace which is the true life (Matt. v, 22–24). Everything is comprised in this commandment; but Jesus knew the worldly temptations that prevent peace among men. The first temptation perilous to peace is that of the sexual relation. We are not to consider the body as an instrument of lust; each man is to have one wife, and each woman one husband, and one is never to forsake the other under any pretext. (Matt. v, 28–32.)

I cannot make any distinction between unions that are called by the name of marriage, and those that are denied this name. I am obliged to consider as sacred and absolute the sole and unique union by which man is once for all indissolubly bound to the first woman with whom he has been united.—(*M. R.*, 270.) The second temptation is that of the oath, which draws men into sin; this is wrong, and we are not to be bound by any such promise (Matt. v, 34–37). The third temptation is that of vengeance, which we call human justice; this we are not to resort to under any pretext; we are to endure offenses and never to return evil for evil (Matt. v, 38–42). The fourth temptation is that arising from difference in nationalities, from hostility between peoples and States; but we are to remember that all men are brothers, and children of the same Father, and thus take care that difference in nationality leads not to the destruction of peace (Matt. v, 43–48).—(*M. R.*, 160.)

What is the law of nature? Is it to know that my security and that of my family, all my amusements and pleasures, are purchased at the expense of misery, deprivation, and suffering to thousands of human beings — by the terror of the gallows: by the misfortune of thousands stifling within prison walls; by the fears inspired by millions of soldiers

and guardians of civilization, torn from their homes and besotted by discipline, to protect our pleasures with loaded revolvers against the possible interference of the famishing? Is it to purchase every fragment of bread that I put in my mouth and the mouths of my children by the numberless privations that are necessary to procure my abundance? Or is it to be certain that my piece of bread only belongs to me when I know that everyone else has a share, and that no one starves while I eat? — (*M. R.*, Ed. 1885, 46.)

Jesus said, simply and clearly, that the law of resistance to evil by violence, which has been made the basis of society, is false, and contrary to man's nature; . . . "You believe" (he says in substance) "that your laws, which resort to violence, correct evil; not at all; they only augment it. For thousands of years you have tried to destroy evil by evil, and you have not destroyed it; you have only augmented it. Do as I command you, follow my example, and you will know that my doctrine is true." Not only in words, but by his acts, by his death, did Jesus propound his doctrine, "Resist not evil."—(*M. R.*, Ed. 1885, 40–41.)

Two classes of men would never, even by implication, admit the literal interpretation of the law "Resist not evil." These men were at the ex-

treme poles of the social scale — they were the conservative Christian patriots who maintained the infallibility of the Church, and the atheistic revolutionists. Neither of these two classes was willing to renounce the right to resist by violence what they regarded as evil. And the wisest and most intelligent among them would not acknowledge the simple and evident truth, that if we once admit the right of any man to resist by violence what he regards as evil, every other man has equally the right to resist by violence what he regards as evil. — (*M. R.*, 107.)

We have only to examine closely the complicated mechanism of our institutions that are based upon coercion to realize that coercion and violence are contrary to human nature. The judge who has condemned according to the code, is not willing to hang the criminal with his own hands; no clerk would tear a villager from his weeping family and cast him into prison; the general or the soldier, unless he be hardened by discipline and service, will not undertake to slay a hundred Turks or Germans or destroy a village, he would not, if he could help it, kill a single man. Yet all these things are done, thanks to the administrative machinery which divides responsibility for misdeeds in such a way that no one feels them to be contrary to nature.—(*M. R.*, 111.)

When I had read these comments, I understood that unless I excepted from the oaths forbidden by Jesus the oath of fidelity to the State, the commandment was as insignificant as superficial, and as easy to practice as I had supposed.—(*M. R.*, 143.)

The doctrine of Jesus is to bring the kingdom of God upon earth. The practice of this doctrine is not difficult; and not only so, its practice is a natural expression of the belief of all who recognize the truth. The doctrine of Jesus offers the only possible chance of salvation for those who would escape the perdition that threatens the personal life. The fulfillment of this doctrine not only will deliver men from the privations and sufferings of this life, but will put an end to nine-tenths of the suffering endured in behalf of the doctrine of the world.—(*M. R.*, 238.)

If the practice of the doctrine of the world were easy, agreeable, and without danger, we might perhaps believe that the practice of the doctrine of Jesus is difficult, frightful, and cruel. But the doctrine of the world is much more difficult, more dangerous, and more cruel, than is the doctrine of Jesus. Formerly, we are told, there were martyrs for the cause of Jesus; but they were exceptional. We cannot count up more than about three hundred and eighty thousand of them,

voluntary and involuntary, in the whole course of eighteen hundred years; but who shall count the martyrs of the doctrine of the world? For each Christian martyr there have been a thousand martyrs to the doctrine of the world, and the sufferings of each one of them have been a hundred times more cruel than those endured by others. The number of the victims of wars in our century alone amounts to thirty millions of men. There are the martyrs to the doctrine of the world, who would have escaped suffering and death even if they had refused to follow the doctrine of the world, to say nothing of following the doctrine of Jesus.—(*M. R.*, 226.)

"But there are wicked men among compatriots; they will attack a Christian, and if the Christian do not defend himself, will pillage and massacre him and his family." No; they will not do so. If all the members of this family are Christians, and consequently hold their lives only for the service of others, no man will be found insane enough to deprive such people of the necessaries of life or to kill them. The famous Maclay lived among the most bloodthirsty of savages; they did not kill him, they reverenced him and followed his teachings, simply because he did not fear them, exacted nothing from them, and treated them always with kindness.—(*M. R.*, 276.)

Exile and imprisonment and death afford to the Christian the possibility of bearing witness of the truth, not in words, but in acts. Violence, war, brigandage, executions, are not accomplished through the forces of unconscious nature; they are accomplished by men who are blinded, and do not know the truth. Consequently, the more evil these men do to Christians, the further they are from the truth, the more unhappy they are, and the more necessary it is that they should have knowledge of the truth. Now a Christian cannot make known his knowledge of truth except by abstaining from the errors that lead men into evil; he must render good for evil.—(*M. R.*, 277.)

A true Christian cannot claim any rights of property. . . . All that he uses, a Christian only uses till somebody takes it from him.—(*M. L.*, 359.)

True Christians will always prefer to be killed by a madman rather than to deprive him of his liberty. . . . Anoútchin asked Tolstoy, "May I kill a wolf that attacks me?" He replied: "No, you must not; for if we may kill a wolf, we may also kill a dog, and a man, and there will be no limit! Such cases are quite exceptional; and if we once admit that we may kill, and may resist evil, — evil and falsehood will reign in the whole world

unchecked, as we see is now the case."—(*M. L.*, 358–9, 476.)

Jesus said that we were not to be angry, and not to consider ourselves as better than others; if we were angry, and offended others, so much the worse for us. Again, he said that we were to avoid libertinism, and to that end choose one woman, to whom we should remain faithful. Once more, he said that we were not to bind ourselves by promises or oaths to the service of those who may constrain us to commit acts of folly or wickedness. Then he said that we were not to return evil for evil, lest the evil rebound upon ourselves with redoubled force. And, finally, he says that we are not to consider men as foreigners because they dwell in another country and speak a language different from our own. And the conclusion is, that if we avoid doing any of these foolish things, we shall be happy. —(*M. R.*, 227, also Ed. 1885, 194.)

While I now see that anger is an abnormal, pernicious, and morbid state, I also perceive the temptation that led me into it. The temptation was in separating myself from my fellows, recognizing only a few of them as my equals, and regarding all the others as persons of no account (raca) or as uncultivated animals (fools). I see now that this willful separation from other men, this judgment of raca or fool passed upon others, was the

principal source of my disagreements. In looking over my past life I saw that I had rarely permitted my anger to rise against those whom I considered as my equals, whom I seldom abused. But the least disagreeable action on the part of one whom I considered an inferior inflamed my anger and led me to abusive words or actions, and the more superior I felt myself to be, the less careful I was of my temper.—(*M. R.*, 267.)

I understand now why those that are great in the sight of men are an abomination to God, and why woe is threatened the rich and mighty and blessedness is promised the poor and humble. . . . Now, I can no longer give my support to anything that lifts me above or separates me from others. I cannot, as I once did, recognize in myself or others titles or ranks or qualities aside from the title and quality of manhood. I can no longer seek for fame and glory; I can no longer cultivate a system of instruction which separates me from men. I cannot in my surroundings, my food, my clothing, my manners, strive for what not only separates me from others but renders me a reproach to the majority of mankind.—(*M. R.* 267–8.)

CHAPTER III

THE CHURCH

THE Christian Church has recognized and sanctioned divorce, slavery, tribunals, all earthly powers, the death penalty, and war; it has exacted nothing except a renunciation on the occasion of baptism of a purpose to do evil, and this only in its early days; later on, when infant baptism was introduced, even this requirement was no longer observed.

The Church confesses the doctrine of Jesus in theory, but denies it in practice.—(*M. R.*, 247.) One of the organs of the doctrine of Jesus, it has fulfilled its mission and is now useless. The world cannot be bound to the Church; but the deliverance of the world from the Church will not ensure life. —(*M. R.*, 258.)

Believe, if you will, in paradise, in hell, in the pope, in the Church, in the sacraments, in the redemption; pray according to the dictates of your faith, attend upon your devotions, sing your hymns,— but all this will not prevent you from practicing the five commandments given by Jesus

for your welfare: . . . But, do not calmly sit down as you do now, and so organize your existence as to render it a task of extreme difficulty not to be angry, not to commit adultery, not to take oaths, not to resist evil, not to make war; organize rather an existence which shall render the doing of all these things as difficult as the non-performance of them is now laborious.—(*M. R.*, 263.)

Let us suppose that you are an unbeliever, a philosopher, it matters not of what special school. . . . The doctrine of Jesus does not oppose your views; it is in harmony with the law that you have discovered. But, aside from this law . . . there is still your own personal life to be considered. This life you can use by living in conformity to reason, and you have now for its guidance no rule whatever, except the decrees drawn up by men whom you do not esteem, and enforced by the police. The doctrine of Jesus offers you rules which are assuredly in accord with your law of "altruism," which is nothing but a feeble paraphrase of this same doctrine of Jesus.—(*M. R.*, 263.)

The arbitrary separation of the metaphysical and ethical aspects of Christianity entirely disfigures the doctrine, and deprives it of every sort of meaning. The separation began with the preaching of Paul, who knew but imperfectly the ethical doctrine set

forth in the Gospel of Matthew, and who preached a metaphysico-cabalistic theory entirely foreign to the doctrine of Jesus; and this theory was perfected under Constantine, when the existing pagan social organization was proclaimed Christian simply by covering it with the mantle of Christianity. The Church in spite of all Constantine's crimes and vices admits that arch-pagan to the category of the saints; after him began the domination of the councils and the center of gravity of Christianity was permanently displaced till only the metaphysical portion was left in view. And this metaphysical theory with its accompanying ceremonial deviated more and more from its true and primitive meaning, until it has reached its present stage of development, as a doctrine which explains the mysteries of a celestial life beyond the comprehension of human reason, and, with all its complicated formulas, gives no religious guidance whatever with regard to the regulations of this earthly life.—(*M. R.*, 245–6.)

Let it be considered that these selected Gospels are the work of many human minds, that during centuries they underwent endless revisions, that all the Gospels of the fourth century which have reached us are written without punctuation or division into verse and chapter, and that the actual number of different renderings for Gospel pas-

sages is estimated at fifty thousand.—(*S. C. T.*)

The Church composed of men united, not by promises or sacraments, but by deeds of truth and love, has always lived and will live forever. . . . The members of this Church know that life is to them a blessing as long as they maintain fraternity with others and dwell in the fellowship of the son of man. . . . And so the members of this Church practice the commandments of Jesus and thereby teach them to others. Whether this Church be in numbers little or great, it is, nevertheless, the Church that shall never perish, the Church that shall finally unite within its bonds the hearts of all mankind.—(*M. R.*, 278.)

CHAPTER IV

THE SCHOOL

TOLSTOY used the school as a laboratory for experiments. He has the habit of mind of questioning all traditions and customs in all realms of thought and activity, and of making them answer for themselves, and he carried it with him into the field of education.—(*Tolstoy as a Schoolmaster*, 23, By Ernest H. Crosby.)

Tolstoy does not believe in interfering in the fights of children. The master throws himself between them to separate them, and the two enemies look at each other angrily. Unable to restrain themselves even in the presence of the master whom they fear, they end by grappling with each other more hotly than ever. How many times on the same day do I see Kirouschka, with set teeth, fall upon Taraska, seize him by the hair and throw him down; it looks as if he wished to disfigure him and leave him for dead. But before a moment has passed Taraska is already laughing under Kirouschka and turns the tables on him. In five minutes they are good

friends again, sitting side by side.—(*T. S. M.*, 11.)

To my mind, this disorder on the surface is useful and necessary, however strange and irksome it may seem to the master. . . . In the first place, this disorder, or rather this free order, only appears frightful to us because we are accustomed to an entirely different system, according to which we have been educated ourselves. Secondly, in this case, as in many others, the use of force is founded only upon an inconsiderate and disrespectful interpretation of human nature. It seems as if the disorder were gaining and growing from instant to instant, as if nothing could stop it but coercion, when, if we only wait a moment, we see the disorder (like a fire) go down of itself and produce an order much better and more stable than that which we should substitute for it.

He insists that throughout the children should be treated as reasoning and reasonable beings, who will find out for themselves that order is necessary, but who resent forcible interference, independent of their own experience.—(*T. S. M.*, 9, 10.)

In the world which calls itself practical, the world of the Palmerstons and Cains (Tolstoy wrote this in the early sixties), the world which holds for reasonable not that which is reasonable

but that which is practical — there, in that world, let the people arrogate to themselves the right of duty and punishing. But our world of children, of beings simple and frank, should be kept free from falsehood and from this criminal belief in the propriety of chastisement, from this theory that vengeance is just, as soon as we call it punishment.—(*T. S. M.*, 16.)

A healthy child, when he comes into the world, realizes completely the absolute harmony with the true, the beautiful, and the good which we carry in us; he is still in touch with inanimate things, with plant and animal life, with that nature which personifies in our eyes that true, beautiful and good which we seek and long for. . . . But every hour of life, every minute of time, disturbs more and more those relations which, when he was born, were in a perfectly harmonious equilibrium, and every step, every hour, violates this harmony.

Education perverts a child, it cannot correct him. The more he is perverted, the less must we educate him, and the more does he need freedom.—(*T. S. M.*, 30.)

There is in a school, something undefined, which is almost entirely independent of the master's control, something absolutely unknown to the science of pedagogy, and which constitutes notwithstanding the very foundation of success in teaching —

it is the spirit of the school. The master has indeed a negative influence upon it, for unless he abstains from certain things, he may destroy it. This spirit increases in proportion as the master allows the pupils to think for themselves, and with the number of pupils, and it decreases in proportion as the lessons and hours are lengthened. It communicates itself from child to child and to the teacher himself, and shows itself in the sound of the voice, in looks, in gestures, in rivalries — something very palpable, necessary and precious, and which consequently every master ought to cherish. It is a spirit of ardor which is as necessary to intellectual nourishment as the saliva is to digestion. It cannot be artificially produced, but it springs from life of itself. It is the teacher's duty to find some useful object for this spirit to spend itself upon, and not to try to quench it.— (*T. S. M.*, 34.)

The more a people advances, the more does true education desert the school for the region of real life outside. And the effort of a school which wishes to adapt itself to this progress should be to answer the questions suggested by the home life of the pupil, for it is in his home and among his neighbors that he is brought face to face with life. The prevailing education of the day Tolstoy condemns as moral despotism, the determination of

one individual to make another individual exactly like himself, and this he declares to be unjustifiable invasion of the rights of the individual. We have no ethical right to do it. That the pupils should come to learn of their own accord, when they desire it, is a *conditio sine quâ non* of all fruitful teaching, just as in feeding it is a *conditio sine quâ non* that the eater should be hungry. The sole basis of education is freedom — the freedom of the people to organize their own schools, and of the pupil to make up his own mind as to what he will learn and how he will learn it. And experience alone can point out the best method by indicating the most natural rapport between teacher and scholars. In each concrete case the actual degree of liberty will depend upon the master's talents and sympathy, but he insists upon the general principle that the less the restraint the better the school.—(*T. S. M.*, 44–46.)

Children should be taught as little as possible, for it is much worse (than lack of instruction) that they should get educational indigestion and come to detest education.—(*T. S. M.*, 49.) The very little ones, if they are normally brought up, will themselves ask for lessons and insist on regularity. . . . Yesterday there was a lesson after dinner, and to-day they desire one after dinner.—(*T. S. M.*, 47.)

Text-books usually begin with general ideas, those of grammar with adjectives, those of history with divisions into periods, those of geometry with definition of space and of the mathematical point; but these general ideas are the hardest to comprehend, and the child must begin with something tangible, related to his own common experiences.—(*T. S. M.*, 25.)

It would be as sensible to examine a man of forty in his knowledge of geography as to examine a man of ten. You have to live for months with a person to find out what he knows. And where examinations are made a feature of education they become an end in themselves, and the student no longer really learns philosophy or history, but he learns the altogether distinct art of answering examination questions, a totally useless branch of study.—(*T. S. M.*, 32.) Children like history only when it is vivified by art. They have no interest in history as such, and the phrase "a child's history" is an absurdity.—(*T. S. M.*, 41.)

With regard to drawing and music — the teaching of the piano is a glaring example of wrongly organized instruction. As with drawing, so also with music — children should be taught to make use of the means which are always at hand (in drawing to use chalk, charcoal, pencil; in music to be able to communicate what they see

and hear through the medium of their own voices.) This to begin with.[1]—(*T. S. M.*, 47–48.)

Under the head of enlightenment is included working for one's self and family and for others, cleaning, putting in order, cooking, preparing fuel, and so forth. The other half of the time I would give to instruction. I would let the pupil choose out of seven subjects the one to which he is attracted. With regard to the teaching of languages, the more languages are taught the better. I think French and German should be taught by all means, English and Esperanto if possible. And one should teach by inviting the pupil to read in the language he is learning a book with which he is acquainted in his native language, endeavoring to grasp the general sense and incidentally observing the most important words, their roots and grammatical forms.—(*T. S. M.*, 47–48.)

I do not believe in exercising coercion on my fellow-men, and hence I cannot undertake to execute or imprison them directly or indirectly. Let him who is without sin cast the first stone. Who am I to act as judge? And as people come gradu-

[1] Tolstoy regards enlightenment as part of education as do all educators, but his estimate of "enlightenment" differs from that of the average educationist.— (*Ed.*)

ally round to my opinion, there will be fewer and fewer left who will be willing to act as hangmen and jailers and warders, until finally such professions disappear.—(*T. S. M.*, 74–75.)

CHAPTER V

ART

We cannot fail to observe that art is one of the means of intercourse between man and man.—(*What is Art,* 40.)

I began to write on art fifteen years ago, thinking that when once I undertook the task I should be able to accomplish it without a break. It proved, however, that my views on the matter were then so far from clear that I could not arrange them in a way that satisfied me. From that time I have never ceased to think on the subject, and I have recommenced to write on it six or seven times; but each time, after writing a considerable part of it, I have found myself unable to bring the work to a satisfactory conclusion, and I have had to put it aside.—(*W. A.,* 173.)

Art begins when one person, with the object of joining another or others to himself in one and the same feeling, expresses that feeling by certain external indications. To take the simplest example: a boy, having experienced, let us say, fear on encountering a wolf, relates that encounter;

and, in order to call out in others the feeling he has experienced, describes himself, his condition before the encounter, the surroundings, the wood, his own light-heartedness and then the wolf's appearance, its movements, the distance between himself and the wolf, etc. If only the boy when telling the story, again experiences the feelings he had lived through and infects the hearers and compels them to feel what the narrator had experienced, all this is art. It is art even if the boy had not seen a wolf but had been afraid of one, and if, wishing to evoke in others the fear he had felt, he invented an encounter with a wolf, and recounted it so as to make his hearers share the feelings he experienced, either the fear of suffering or the attraction of enjoyment (whether in reality or in imagination), expresses these feelings on canvas or in marble so that others are infected by them. And it is also art if a man feels or imagines to himself feelings of delight, gladness, sorrow, despair, courage, or despondency, and the transition from one to another of these feelings, and expresses these feelings by sounds, so that the hearers are infected by them, and experience them as they were experienced by the composer.

The feelings with which the artist infects others may be most various — very strong or very weak, very important or very insignificant, very bad or

very good: feelings of love for native land, self-devotion and submission to fate or to God expressed in a drama, raptures of lovers described in a novel, feelings of voluptuousness expressed in a picture, courage expressed in a triumphal march, merriment evoked by a dance, humor evoked by a funny story, the feeling of quietness transmitted by an evening landscape or by a lullaby, or the feeling of admiration brought out by a beautiful arabesque — it is all art.—(*W. A.*, 42–43.)

The artists of the Middle Ages, vitalized by the same source of feeling — religion — as the mass of the people, and transmitting, in architecture, sculpture, painting, music, poetry, or drama, the feelings and states of mind they experienced, were true artists; and their activity, founded on the highest conceptions accessible to their age and common to the entire people, though, for our times a mean art, was nevertheless, a true one, shared by the whole community.—(*W. A.*, 49.)

As soon as art became, not art for the whole people but for a rich class, it became a profession; as soon as it became a profession methods were devised to teach it; people who chose this profession of art began to learn these methods, and thus professional schools sprang up: classes of rhetoric or literature in the public schools, academies for painting, conservatories for music, schools for

dramatic art. . . . In these schools art is taught! But art is the transmission to others of a special feeling experienced by the artist.—(*W. A.*, 107.)

Universal art arises only when some one of the people, having experienced a strong emotion, feels the necessity of transmitting it to others. The art of the rich class, on the other hand, arises not from the artist's inner impulse, but chiefly because people of the upper classes demand amusement and pay well for it. They demand from art the transmission of feelings that please them, and this demand artists try to meet. But it is a very difficult task; for people of the wealthy classes, spending their lives in idleness and luxury, desire to be continually diverted by art; and art, even the lowest, cannot be produced at will, but has to generate spontaneously in the artist's inner self. And therefore, to satisfy the demands of people of the upper classes, artists have had to devise methods of producing imitations of art. And such methods have been devised. These are (1) borrowing, (2) imitating, (3) striking (effects), and (4) interesting.—(*W. A.*, 92.)

It is often said that it is horrible and pitiful to see little acrobats putting their legs over their necks, but it is not less pitiful to see children of ten giving concerts, and it is still worse to see

schoolboys of ten who, as a preparation for literary work, have learnt by heart the exceptions to the Latin grammar. These people not only grow physically and mentally deformed, but also morally deformed, and become incapable of doing anything really needed by man. Occupying in society the rôle of amusers of the rich, they lose their sense of human dignity, and develop in themselves such a passion for public applause that they are always a prey to an inflated and unsatisfied vanity which grows in them to diseased dimensions, and they expend their mental strength in efforts to obtain satisfaction for this passion. And what is most tragic of all is that these people who for the sake of art are spoilt for life, not only do not render service to this art, but, on the contrary, inflict the greatest harm on it. They are taught in academies, schools, and conservatories how to counterfeit art, and by learning this they so pervert themselves that they quite lose the capacity to produce works of real art, and become purveyors of that counterfeit, or trivial, or depraved art which floods our society.—(*W. A.*, 155.)

Art, all art, has this characteristic, that it unites people. Every art causes those to whom the artist's feeling is transmitted to unite in soul with the artist, and also with all who receive the same impression.—(*W. A.*, 142.)

In former times, when the highest religious perception united only some people (who, even if they formed a large society, were yet but one society surrounded by others — Jews, or Athenian or Roman citizens), the feelings transmitted by the art of that time flowed from a desire for the might, greatness, glory, and prosperity of that society, and the heroes of art might be people who contributed to that prosperity by strength, by craft, by fraud, or by cruelty (Ulysses, Jacob, Samson, Hercules, and all the Heroes). But the religious perception of our time does not select any one society of men; on the contrary, it demands the union of all — absolutely of all people without exception — and above every other virtue it sets brotherly love to all men. And, therefore, the feelings transmitted by the art of our time not only cannot coincide with the feeling transmitted by former art, but must run counter to them.— (*W. A.*, 140.)

Sometimes people who are together are, if not hostile to one another, at least estranged in mood and feeling, till perchance a story, a performance, a picture, or even a building, but oftenest of all music unites them as by an electric flash, and, in place of their former isolation or even enmity, they are all conscious of union and mutual love. Each is glad that another feels what he feels; glad of

the communion established, not only between him and all present, but also with all now living who will yet share the same impression; and more than that, he feels the mysterious gladness of a communion which, reaching beyond the grave, unites us with all men of the past who have been moved by the same feelings, and with all men of the future who will yet be touched by them. And this effect is produced both by the religious art which transmits feelings of love to God and one's neighbor, and by universal art transmitting the very simplest feelings common to all men.—(*W. A.*, 144.)

Christian art either evokes in men those feelings which, through love of God and of one's neighbor, draw them to greater and even greater union, and make them ready for it and capable of such union; or evokes in them those feelings which show them that they are already united in the joys and sorrows of life. And therefore the Christian art of our time can be and is of two kinds: (1) art transmitting feelings flowing from a religious perception of man's position in the world in relation to God and to his neighbor — religious art in the limited meaning of the term; and (2) art transmitting the simplest feelings of common life, but such, always, as are accessible to all men in the whole world — the art of common life — the art

of a people — universal art. Only these two kinds of art can be considered good art in our time. —(*W. A.*, 144–5.)

The old art, having no longer, in our day, any source in religious perception, has lost its meaning, and we shall have to abandon it whether we wish to or not.—(*W. A.*, 142.) The religious perception of our time — which consists in acknowledging that the aim of life (both collective and individual) is the union of mankind — is already so sufficiently distinct that people have now only to reject the false theory of beauty, according to which enjoyment is considered to be the purpose of art, and religious perception will naturally take its place as the guide of the art of our time.—(*W. A.*, 165.)

All these people, artists, and public, and critics, with very few exceptions, have never (except in childhood and earliest youth, before hearing any discussions on art) experienced that simple feeling familiar to the plainest man and even to a child — which is at the very essence of art, that sense of infection with another's feeling — compelling us to joy in another's gladness, to sorrow at another's grief, and to mingle souls with another. And therefore these people not only cannot distinguish true works of art from counterfeits, but continually mistake for real art the worst and

most artificial, while they do not even perceive works of real art, because the counterfeits are always more ornate, while true art is modest.—(*W. A.*, 131–2.)

Among the Greeks, art transmitting the feeling of beauty, strength, and courage (Hesiod, Homer, Phidias) was chosen, approved, and encouraged; while art transmitting feelings of rude sensuality, despondency, and effeminacy was condemned and despised. Among the Jews, art transmitting feelings of devotion and submission to their God and to his will (the epic of Genesis, the prophets, the Psalms) was chosen and encouraged, while art transmitting feelings of idolatry (the golden calf) was condemned and despised. All the rest of art-stories, songs, dances, ornamentation of houses, of utensils, and of clothes — which was not contrary to religious perception, was neither distinguished nor discussed. Thus has art been appraised always and everywhere, in regard to its subject-matter, and thus it should be appraised, for this attitude towards art proceeds from the fundamental characteristics of human nature, and those characteristics do not change.—(*W. A.*, 137.)

Art is not a handicraft; it is the transmission of feeling the artist has experienced. And sound feeling can only be engendered in a man when he is living on all its sides the life natural and proper

to mankind. And therefore security of maintenance is a condition most harmful to an artist's true productiveness, since it removes him from the condition natural to all men — that of struggle with nature for the maintenance of both his own life and that of others — and thus deprives him of opportunity and possibility to experience the most important and natural feelings of man. There is no position more injurious to an artist's productiveness than that position of complete security and luxury in which artists usually live in our society.—(*W. A.*, 169.)

As the evolution of knowledge proceeds by truer and more necessary knowledge dislodging and replacing what is mistaken and unnecessary, so the evolution of feeling proceeds through art — feelings less kind and less needful for the well-being of mankind are replaced by others kinder and more needful for that end. That is the purpose of art. And, speaking now of its subject-matter, the more art fulfills that purpose the better the art, and the less it fulfills it the worse the art.

And the appraisement of feelings (*i. e.*, the acknowledgment of these or those feelings as being more or less good, more or less necessary for the well-being of mankind) is taken as the religious perception of the age.—(*W. A.*, 136.)

(When Tolstoy pronounces Shakespeare's

dramas " trivial and positively bad," most persons are inclined to think the verdict absurd or to put it down as another instance of what he wrote himself, " Sometimes saying not quite what I think or feel — not that I do not wish to say it, but that I am unable and often exaggerate." But no one will lightly brush the verdict aside who reads his most amusing little book on Shakespeare and sees the vast research which forced him reluctantly to that conclusion. By his account of the story of King Lear, he makes that narrative as ridiculous as he does Wagner's Nibelung's Ring in the Appendix to *What is Art?* — ED.)

Shakespeare's characters are placed in tragic positions which are impossible, do not flow from the course of events, are inappropriate to time and space and besides this, act in a way that is out of keeping with their definite characters and is quite arbitrary.—(*Essay on Shakespeare,* 52.)

He " can't bear Shakespeare "—(*M. L.,* 519) — he finds him undemocratic, lacking in sense of proportion, and that " his characters, except that of Falstaff, are eccentric, false, incoherent, and almost unintelligible."—(*E. S.*)

The style of speech of every person natural to his character . . . is absent from Shakespeare. . . . The words of one of the personages might be put in the mouth of another: for

by the character of the speech it would be impossible to distinguish the speaker.—(*E. S.*, 56.) He does not grasp the natural character of the positions of his personages, nor the language of the persons represented, nor the feeling of measure without which no work can be artistic.—(*E. S.*, 96.)

The subject of Shakespeare's pieces . . . the lowest, most vulgar view of life which regards the external elevation of the lords of the world as a genuine distinction, despises the crowd, *i. e.*, the working classes — repudiates not only all religions, but also all humanitarian strivings directed to the betterment of the existing order.—(*E. S.*, 93.)

The third and most important condition, sincerity, is completely absent in all Shakespeare's works. In all of them one sees intentional artifice: one sees that he is not *in earnest*.—(*E. S.*, 94.)

Tolstoy, although his own art was, on the whole, kindly received by the critics, considers that professional criticism, called out like professional art, by the demands of the rich, is responsible for our false standards of greatness.

He condemns the "rude savage" works of the Greeks: "A half savage slave-holding people, who imitated the naked human body exceedingly

well and made buildings pleasant to look at," but whose literary works are often without meaning to us. And with their dramatists — Sophocles, Euripides, Æschylus, Aristophanes, he groups Dante, Milton and Shakespeare, and of painters, Raphael, Michael Angelo "including his absurd 'Last Judgment'"— and also the composers, Bach and Beethoven. Later, however, he writes of "those pleasant, clear and strong musical impressions which are transmitted by the melodies of Bach's arias — and of Beethoven himself in his earlier period."—(*W. A.*, 127.) He adds that he "considers the Ibsens, Maeterlincks, Verlaines, in music the Wagners, Liszts, Berliozes, Brahmses and Richard Strausses as imitators followed by a crowd of worthless imitators of these imitators." —(*W. A.*, 106.)

CHAPTER VI

SCIENCE

Science and art are as closely bound together as the lungs and the heart, so that if one organ is vitiated the other cannot act rightly. True science investigates and brings to human perception such truths and such knowledge as the people of a given time and society consider most important. Art transmits these truths from the region of perception to the region of emotion. Therefore, if the path chosen by science be false so also will be the path taken by art.—(*W. A.*, 174.)

As by the theory of art for art's sake it appears that occupation with all those things that please us — is art, so it appears that the theory of science for science's sake, the study of that which interests us — is science. So that one side of science, instead of studying how people should live in order to fulfill their mission in life, demonstrates the righteousness and immutability of the bad and false arrangements of life which exist around us; while the other part, experimental science, occupies

itself with questions of simple curiosity or with technical improvements.—(*W. A.*, 176.)

Books and sermons appear, demonstrating that church dogmas are antiquated and absurd, as well as the necessity of establishing a reasonable religious perception suitable to our times, and all the theology that is considered to be real science is only engaged in refuting these works and in exercising intelligence again and again to find support and justification for superstitions long since outlived, that have now become quite meaningless. Or a sermon appears showing that land should not be an object of private possession, and that the institution of private property in land is a chief cause of the poverty of the masses. Apparently science, real science, should welcome such a sermon and draw further deductions from this position. But the science of our times does nothing of the kind: on the contrary, political economy demonstrates the opposite position, namely, that landed property, like every other form of property, must be more and more concentrated in the hands of a small number of owners.

Again, in the same way, one would suppose it to be the business of real science to demonstrate the irrationality, unprofitableness, and immorality of war and of executions; or the absurdity, harmfulness, and immorality of using narcotics or of

eating animals; or the irrationality, harmfulness, and antiquatedness of patriotism. And such works exist, but are all considered unscientific; while works to prove that all these things ought to continue, and works intended to satisfy an idle thirst for knowledge lacking any relation to human life, are considered to be scientific.—(*W. A.*, 179.)

Certain ideals are expressed not only in stupid, fashionable books, describing the world as it will be in 1,000 or 3,000 years' time, but also by sociologists who consider themselves serious men of science. These ideals are that food instead of being obtained from the land by agriculture, will be prepared in laboratories by chemical means, and that human labor will be almost entirely superseded by the utilization of natural forces.—And, meanwhile, it is forgotten that nourishment with corn, vegetables, and fruit raised from the soil by one's own labor is the pleasantest, healthiest, easiest, and most natural nourishment, and that the work of using one's muscles is as necessary a condition of life as is the oxidation of the blood by breathing.—(*W. A.*, 180–1.)

Dr. E. A. Steiner asked, "But isn't Socialism a preparation for an ideal State?"

"No, indeed not," answered Tolstoy. "It is just the contrary. It will regulate everything,

put everything under law, it will destroy the individual, it will enslave him. Socialism begins at the wrong end. You cannot organize anything until you have individuals. . . . Socialism begins to regulate the world away from itself. You must make yourself right before the world around you can be made right. . . . The modern labor leader wishes to liberate the masses while he himself is a slave."

The modern scientists need only tear themselves away from the psychological microscope under which they examine the objects of their study, and look about them, in order to see how insignificant is all that has afforded them such naïve pride, all that knowledge not only of geometry of n-dimensions, spectrum analysis of the Milky Way, the form of atoms, dimensions of human skulls of the Stone Age, and similar trifles, but even our knowledge of micro-organism, X-rays, etc., in comparison with such knowledge as we have thrown aside and handed over to the perversions of the professors of theology, jurisprudence, political economy, financial science, etc. We need only look around us to perceive that the activity proper to real science is not the study of whatever happens to interest us, but the study of how man's life should be established — the study of those questions of religion, morality, and social life, without

the solution of which all our knowledge of nature will be harmful or insignificant.

We are highly delighted and very proud that our science renders it possible to utilize the energy of a waterfall and make it work in factories, or that we have pierced tunnels through mountains, and so forth. But the pity of it is that we make the force of the waterfall labor, not for the benefit of the workmen, but to enrich capitalists who produce articles of luxury or weapons of man-destroying war. The same dynamite with which we blast the mountains to pierce tunnels, we use for wars, from which latter we not only do not intend to abstain, but which we consider inevitable, and for which we unceasingly prepare.

If we are now able to inoculate preventatively with diphtheritic microbes, to find a needle in a body by means of X-rays, to straighten a hunched-back, cure syphilis, and perform wonderful operations, we should not be proud of these acquisitions either (even were they all established beyond dispute) if we fully understood the true purpose of real science. If but one-tenth of the efforts now spent on objects of pure curiosity or of merely practical application were expended on real science organizing the life of man, more than half the people now sick would not have the illnesses from which a small minority of them are now cured in

hospitals. There would be no poor-blooded and deformed children growing up in factories, no death-rates, as now, of fifty per cent. among children, no deterioration of whole generations, no prostitution, no syphilis, and no murdering of hundreds of thousands in wars, nor those horrors of folly and of misery which our present science considers a necessary condition of human life.—(*W. A.*, 177–8.)

But science, true science — such science as would really deserve the respect which is now claimed by the followers of one (the least important) part of science — is not at all such as this: real science lies in knowing what we should and what we should not believe, in knowing how the associated life of man should and should not be constituted; how to treat sexual relations, how to educate children, how to use the land, how to cultivate it oneself without oppressing other people, how to treat foreigners, how to treat animals, and much more that is important for the life of man. Such has true science ever been and such it should be. And science is springing up in our time. . . . — (*W. A.*, 178.)

The great majority of men in our times lack good and sufficient food (as well as dwellings and clothes and all the first necessaries of life). And

this great majority of men is compelled, to the injury of its well-being, to labor continually beyond its strength. Both these evils can easily be removed by abolishing mutual strife, luxury, and the unrighteous distribution of wealth, in a word by the abolition of a false and harmful order and the establishment of a reasonable, human manner of life. But science considers the existing order of things to be as immutable as the movements of the planets, and therefore assumes that the purpose of science is — not to elucidate the falseness of this order and to arrange a new, reasonable way of life — but, under the existing order of things, to feed everybody and enable all to be as idle as are the ruling classes, who live a depraved life.— (*W. A.*, 180.)

Art is not a pleasure, a solace, or an amusement; art is a great matter. Art is an organ of human life, transmitting man's reasonable perception into feeling. In our age the common religious perception of man is the consciousness of the brotherhood of man — we know that the well-being of man lies in union with his fellow-men. True science should indicate the various methods of applying this consciousness to life. Art should transform this perception into feeling.—(*W. A.*, 183.)

Possibly, in the future, science may reveal to art

yet newer and higher ideals, which art may realize; but, in our time, the destiny of art is clear and definite. The task for Christian art is to establish brotherly union among men.—(*W. A.*, 184.)

CHAPTER VII

WHAT, THEN, MUST WE DO?

In *What to Do,* written in 1882, is the practical summing up of Tolstoy's teaching, the summing up of what set him to make shoes and to produce with his hands things that people need. He writes in a letter, 1879:

"I should very much like to be firmly convinced that I give people more than I take from them — I do not hope by simply intensifying my labor and choosing what is most difficult to assure myself that their account with me does not land them in a loss (I am sure to tell myself that the work I like is the most necessary and difficult). Therefore I wish to take as little from others as possible and to work as much as possible for the satisfaction of my own needs; and I think that is the easiest way to avoid making a mistake."—(*L. T.,* 10.)

It is not enough to tend a man, to feed and teach him Greek; we must teach the man how to live — that is, to take as little as possible from others, and

to give as much as possible; but if we take him into our houses, or into an institution founded for this purpose, we cannot help teaching him to do the contrary. We must express genuine love by "getting off the backs of the poor," by becoming "producers instead of parasites."—(*W. D.*, 70.)

Says Maude: "When in 1909 I told Tolstoy of the Minority Report of the (English) Poor Law Commission he was by no means sympathetic toward it, remarking that 'If you are going to do so much for your poor, you must have robbed them pretty thoroughly first.'—(*M. L.*, 147.)

A great many children in the Rzhánof house were in most wretched conditions; there were the children of prostitutes, there were orphans, there were children who were carried about the streets by beggars. They were all very pitiful. But my experiment with Serozha [a destitute lad whom Tolstoy tried to domesticate.—ED.] showed me that I, living the life I did, was not in a position to help them. While Serozha was living with us, I detected in myself a desire to hide our life from him, and especially the life of our children. I felt that all my efforts to direct him towards a good, industrious life, were counteracted by the examples of our lives and by that of our children.[1]

[1] An amusing instance of the same thing among ourselves, was where a benevolent lady who had a fine resi-

It is very easy to take a child away from a prostitute, or from a beggar. It is very easy, when one has money, to have him washed, cleaned and dressed in good clothes, fed up, and even taught various sciences; but for us who do not earn our own bread, it is not only difficult to teach him to earn his bread, but it is impossible, because by our example, and even by those material improvements of his life which cost us nothing, we teach the opposite.—(*W. D.*, 69–70.) (Arrangement of words changed.—Ed.)

Why were there so many of these poor here in the city? and in what did their peculiarity, as opposed to the country poor, consist? There was one and the same answer to both questions. There were a great many of them here, because here all those people who have no means of subsistence in the country collect around the rich; and their peculiarity lies in this, that they are not people who have

dence on the Hudson took some working girls there for an outing on her lawn.

When they saw the great house, they said "Gracious! What a big house! How many people live there?"

The lady said, "I was ashamed to tell them that only my mother and myself lived there, so I counted up the servants, and told them that there were seventeen. They said 'My! What a big house for only seventeen people.'"— (*Ed.*)

come from the country to support themselves in the city (if there are any city paupers, those who have been born here, and whose fathers were born here, then those fathers came hither for the purpose of earning their livelihood). What is the meaning of this: to earn one's livelihood in the city? In the words "to earn one's livelihood in the city," there is something strange, resembling a jest, when you reflect on their significance. How is it that people go from the country — that is to say, from the places where there are forests, meadows, grain, and cattle, where all the wealth of the earth lies — to earn their livelihood in a place where there are neither trees, nor grass, nor even land, but only stones and dust? — (*W. D.*, 91.)

Everywhere, throughout the whole of Russia,— yes, and not in Russia alone, I think, but throughout the whole world — the same thing goes on. The wealth of the rustic producers passes into the hands of traders, landed proprietors, officials, and factory-owners; and the people who receive this wealth wish to enjoy it. But it is only in the city that they can derive full enjoyment from this wealth. In the country, in the first place, it is difficult to satisfy all the requirements of rich people, on account of the sparseness of the population; banks, shops, hotels, every sort of artisan, and all sorts of social diversions, do not exist there. In

the second place, one of the chief pleasures procured by wealth — vanity, the desire to astonish and outshine other people — is difficult to satisfy in the country; and this, again, on account of the lack of inhabitants. In the country, there is no one to appreciate elegance, no one to be astonished. . . . And, in the third place, luxury is even disagreeable and dangerous in the country for the man possessed of a conscience and of fear. It is an awkward and delicate matter, in the country, to have baths of milk, or to feed your puppies on it, when directly beside you there are children who have no milk.—(*W. D.*, 93–4.)

Who am I, that I should desire to help others? I desire to help people; and I, rising at twelve o'clock after a game of vint with four candles, weak, exhausted, demanding the aid of hundreds of people — I go to the aid of whom? Of people who rise at five o'clock, who sleep on planks, who nourish themselves on bread and cabbage, who know how to plow, to reap, to wield the ax, to chop, to harness, to sew — of people who in strength and endurance, and skill and abstemiousness, are a hundred times superior to me — and I go to their succor! —(*W. D.*, 122.)

I have passed my whole life in this manner; I eat, I talk and I listen; I eat, I write or read, that is to say, I talk and listen again; I eat, I play,

I eat, again I talk and listen, I eat, and again I go to bed; and so each day I can do nothing else, and I understand how to do nothing else. And in order that I may be able to do this, it is necessary that the porter, the peasant, the cook, male or female, the footman, the coachman, and the laundress, should toil from morning till night. . . . And all these people work hard all day long and every day, so that I may be able to talk and eat and sleep. And I, this cripple of a man, have imagined that I could help others, and those the very people who support me! —(*W. D.*, 123.)

And I had gone so far astray that this taking of thousands from the poor with one hand, and flinging of kopeks with the other, to those to whom the whim moved me to give, I called good. No wonder that I felt ashamed.—(*W. D.*, 116.)

I became convinced, after experience, that money is not the representative of labor, but, in the majority of cases, the representative of violence, or of especially complicated sharp practices founded on violence. Money is a new form of slavery which differs from the old form of slavery only in its impersonality, its annihilation of all humane relations with the slave.—(*W. D.*, 128–9.)

We have become specialized. We have our particular functional activity. We are the brains of the people. They support us, and we have

undertaken to teach them. It is only under this pretense that we have excused ourselves from work. But what have we taught them, and what are we now teaching them? . . . And we keep on diverting our minds with chatter, and we instruct each other, and we console ourselves, and we have utterly forgotten them.—(*W. D.*, 193.) Science and art have bestowed a great deal on mankind, not because the men of art and science, under the pretext of a division of labor, live on other people, but in spite of this.—(*W. D.*, 194.)

Surely we have no justification for our privileged position. The priests had a right to their position: they declared that they taught the people life and salvation. But we have taken their place, and we do not instruct the people in life — we even admit that such instruction is unnecessary — but we educate our children in the same Talmudic-Greek and Latin grammar, in order that they may be able to pursue the same life of parasites which we lead ourselves.—(*W. D.*, 224.)

Had I asked, "What am I, so corrupt a man, to do?" the answer would have been easy: "To strive, first of all, to support myself honestly; that is, to learn not to live upon others; and while I am learning, and when I have learned this, to render aid on all possible occasions to the people, with my hands, and my feet, my brain, and my heart,

and with everything to which the people should present a claim."—(*W. D.*, 231.)

Through a whole series of doubts and searchings, I arrived, by a long course of thought, at this remarkable truth: if a man has eyes, it is that he may see with them; if he has ears, that he may hear; and feet, that he may walk; and hands and back, that he may labor; and that if a man will not employ those members for that purpose for which they are intended, it will be the worse for him.—(*W. D.*, 240.)

What, then, will be the outcome of a few eccentric individuals, or madmen, tilling the soil, making shoes, and so on, instead of smoking cigarettes, playing whist, and roaming about everywhere to relieve their tedium, during the space of the ten leisure hours a day which every intellectual worker enjoys? This will be the outcome: that these madmen will show in action, that that imaginary property for which men suffer, and for which they torment themselves and others, is not necessary for happiness; that it is oppressive, and that it is mere superstition; that property, true property, consists only in one's own head and hands; and that, in order to actually exploit this real property with profit and pleasure, it is necessary to reject the false conception of property outside one's own body, upon which we expend the best

efforts of our lives.—(*W. D.*, 259.) This will happen — and it will be very speedily — when people of our set, and after them a vast majority, shall cease to think it disgraceful to pay visits in untanned boots, and not disgraceful to walk in overshoes past people who have no shoes at all; that it is disgraceful not to understand French, and not disgraceful not to have a starched shirt and clean clothes, and not disgraceful to go about in clean garments thereby showing one's idleness; that it is disgraceful to have dirty hands, and not disgraceful not to have hands with callouses.—(*W. D.*, 261.)

As stated in the Bible, a law was given to the man and the woman,— to the man, the law of labor; to the woman, the law of bearing children. —(*W. D.*, 265.)

CHAPTER VIII

WOMEN AND MEN

You women, alone, when you are simple and obedient to the will of God, know not that farcical pretense of labor which the men of our circle call work, and know the true labor imposed by God on men, and know its true rewards, the bliss which it confers. You know this, when, after the raptures of love, you await with emotion, apprehension and terror that torturing state of pregnancy which renders you ailing for nine months, which brings you to intolerable suffering and pain and to the verge of death. You know the conditions of true labor, when, with joy, you await the approach and the increase of the most terrible torture, after which to you alone comes the bliss which you well know. You know this, when, immediately after this torture, without respite, without a break, you undertake another series of toils and sufferings, . . . and sometimes, nay, often, you do not sleep at all for a period of several nights in succession, but with failing arms you walk alone, hushing the sick child who is breaking your heart.

And when you do all this, applauded by no one, and expecting no praises for it from anyone, nor any reward — when you do this, not as an heroic deed, but like the laborer in the Gospel when he came from the field, considering that you have done only that which was your duty, then you know what the false, pretentious labor of men performed for glory really is, and that true labor is fulfilling the will of God, whose command you feel in your heart.—(*W. D.*, 269.)

The woman of our circle has been, and still is, stronger than the man, not by virtue of her fascination, not through her cleverness in performing the same pharisaical semblance of work as man, but because she has not stepped out from under the law that she should undergo that real labor, with danger to her life, with exertion to the last degree, from which the man of the wealthy classes has excused himself.—(*W. D.*, 267.)

"Here! you man," says the woman, "you have departed from your law of real labor, and you want us to bear the burden of our real labor. No, if this is to be so, we understand, as well as you do, how to perform those semblances of labor which you exercise in banks, ministries, universities, and academies; we desire, like yourselves, under the pretext of the division of labor, to make use of the labor of others, and to live for the

gratification of our caprices alone."—(*W. D.*, 266.)

The calling of every individual, man or woman, consists in serving mankind. . . . The difference between man and woman in the execution of this calling lies alone in the means which they employ — that is, by which they serve mankind. . . . The service of mankind resolves itself into two parts:

1. The improvement of the lot of living men and women;

2. The reproduction of mankind itself.

To the former men are chiefly called, since the possibility of the latter service is denied them. To the second women are called, as they are exclusively capacitated therefor. . . . The calling of man is more many-sided and broader, that of woman more uniform and restricted, but deeper.—(Essay, *Man and Woman.*)

According to my view, she will be the ideal woman who, after having assimilated the highest view of life of the age in which she lives, shall devote herself to her service as woman, to her inexorably appointed calling of bearing, nursing and educating the greatest possible number of children who will be capable of serving mankind according to the view of life imbibed from her. —(*Man and Woman.*)

How about those who have no children, who do not enter the married state, the widows? They will do well to take part in the manifold labors of men. But it is deplorable that such a precious instrument as woman has been deprived of the possibility of fulfilling the one great deed peculiar to her, the more so as every woman, after having borne children, if she still has strength, will assist her husband in his work. The assistance of the woman in this work is very precious.

But to see a young woman, capable of bearing children, employed at men's work, will ever be deplorable. To see such a woman is like the sight of rich loam that is covered with gravel for a place or a promenade. It is still more deplorable, as this soil could have produced only grain, while the woman could have produced that which is priceless and than which there is nothing higher — man.

And only she can accomplish that.—(*Man and Woman.*)

Every woman — however magnificent her attire, though her cradle stood at the foot of the throne, though she had mastered all the wealth of science — who indulges in sexual association, but frustrates the possibility of becoming a mother, is a prostitute!

Every other woman, how degraded soever, but

who submits to her husband with the consciousness of the possibility of becoming a mother, fulfills the highest object of life: higher than she there is no one. Such women who fulfill their calling rule over the ruling men; such women prepare a new posterity and guide public opinion, and therefore such women hold within their hands the highest power for the redemption of mankind from the existing and impending evils of our time. Yes, you women who are mothers, in your hands above all rests the salvation of the world.—(*The Mother.*)

It seems to me that marriage ought to take the following shape: the couple unite sexually under the irresistible force of the amorous instinct, the woman becomes pregnant, and the two live like brother and sister, avoiding everything that might prove detrimental to the birth and the nursing of the child, and suppressing instead of arousing, as is now done, all sexual temptation. . . . She bears her child in peace and suckles him, whereby she prospers morally, and only in the free period the couple renew for a few weeks their amorous relations, which are again followed by a period of rest.—(*Second Supplement to Kreutzer Sonata.*)

. . . To get married would not help the service of God and man, though it were done to perpetuate the human race. For that purpose,

instead of getting married and producing fresh children, it would be much simpler to save and rear those millions of children who are now perishing around us for lack of food for their bodies, not to mention food for their souls.

It may be possible to reject Christ's teaching — which permeates our whole life and on which all our morality is founded — but once that teaching is accepted, we cannot but admit that it points to the ideal of complete chastity.

Only if he were sure all existing children were provided for could a Christian enter upon marriage without being conscious of a moral fall.

Men and women must be trained, both by their parents and by public opinion, to look on falling in love and the accompanying sexual desire — whether before or after marriage — not as the poetic and elevated state it is now considered to be, but as an animal state degrading to a human being. And the breach of the promise of fidelity given at marriage should be dealt with by public opinion at least as severely as a breach of pecuniary obligation, or a business fraud, and should on no account be eulogized, as is now done in novels, poems, songs, operas, etc. . . .

Chastity is not a rule or precept, but an ideal, or, rather, one condition of the ideal. But an ideal is an ideal only when its accomplishment is

only possible in *idea,* in thought, when it appears attainable only in infinity, and when the possibility of approaching towards it is therefore infinite. If the ideal were attained, or if we could even picture its attainment by mankind, it would cease to be an ideal.—(*Essays and Letters written* 1888–1903.)

During one of our rounds, a student told me of a woman in one of the lodgings, who traded in her thirteen-year-old daughter. Wishing to save the girl, I purposely went to that lodging. The mother, a small, dark, forty-year-old prostitute, was not merely ugly, but unpleasantly ugly. The daughter was equally unpleasant. To all my indirect questions about their way of life, the mother replied briefly and with hostile distrust, evidently regarding me as an enemy. The daughter always glanced at her mother before she answered me, and evidently trusted her completely. They did not evoke in me cordial pity — rather repulsion; but yet I decided that it was necessary to save the daughter, and that I would speak to some ladies who take an interest in the wretched position of such women, and would send them here. Had I but thought of the long, past life of that mother: of how she bore, nursed, and reared that daughter — in her position assuredly without the least help from others, and with

heavy sacrifices — had I thought of the view that had formed in her mind, I should have understood that in her action there was absolutely nothing bad or immoral. She had done, and was doing, all she could for her daughter — that is to say, just what she herself considered best. One might take the daughter from her mother by force, but one could not convince the mother that it was wrong of her to sell her daughter. To save her, one ought long ago to have saved her mother. One should have saved her from the view of life approved by everybody, which allows a woman to live without marriage, that is, without bearing children and without working, serving only as a satisfaction for sensuality. Had I thought of that, I should have understood that the majority of the ladies I wished to send here to save that girl, themselves live without bearing children and without work, serving merely to satisfy sensuality, and deliberately educate their daughters for such a life. One mother leads her daughter to the traktír, another takes hers to Court, or to a ball. But both share the same view of life: namely, that a woman should satisfy a man's lusts, and that for that service she should be fed, clothed, and cared for. How, then, can our ladies save that woman or her daughter? — (*M. L.*, 131–2.) Andrew D. White reports in the *Idler* (July, 1901) a remark

of Tolstoy's that "Women ought to have all rights except political ones. They are unfit to discharge political duties. Woman is not man's equal in the highest qualities: she is not so self-sacrificing as man. Men will at times sacrifice their families for an idea; women will not."

CHAPTER IX

ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO

WHAT is the true cause of the enormous consumption by men in every condition of life of stimulants and narcotics, such as brandy, wines, haschisch, opium, and several other less active products, such as morphine, ether, and other similar substances? What is the origin of this habit which men have formed? And why has this habit spread so rapidly, and taken such a fast hold on people of all classes and conditions, as well as on the savages whom the former have civilized? To what is this indisputable fact to be attributed, that in places where brandy, wine and beer are unknown people consume opium, haschisch, etc., whilst the use of tobacco is spread over the whole world? . . .

The consumption of these products is incontestably injurious in the highest degree, for it creates evils that cause the deaths of a greater number of human beings than are swept off by the most bloody wars and the most terrible epidemics. Moreover, these men know it. Yes,

they know it so well that it is needless to attempt to give more force to their arguments when they declare that they have taken to the habit simply to drive away cares, to regale themselves, or finally, because "they all do it." There must, however, be some other explanation of this singular phenomenon.

. . . . . .

During the period of conscious life a man has often occasion to distinguish in himself two beings absolutely distinct. The one is blind and sensual, the other enlightened and thoughtful. The former eats, drinks, reposes, and sleeps, refreshes itself, soothes itself like a machine that has been wound up for a specified time. The thoughtful and enlightened being, united to the *sense* being, never acts of its own accord; it only seeks to control and appreciate the conduct of the sense-being, actively assisting the latter when it approves or remaining perfectly neutral in the contrary case.

The thoughtful being, which manifests itself through that which we call conscience, indicates always where the good and the evil are to be found, and we do not perceive it until the moment when we have strayed from the right direction. But as soon as we have committed an act that is contrary to our conscience, the thinking being appears and indicates the extent of the divergence be-

tween the good and the evil path. . . . Let us suppose for example, that the life of a man is not in accord with his conscience, and that this man does not possess the force necessary to re-establish that harmony. . . . The man who wishes to persevere in an evil course, in spite of the admonitions of his conscience, has decided to impoison, to paralyze completely, and for a given period, the organ through the intermediary of which the conscience is manifested.

Men make use of these (divers narcotics and excitants) with a view to stifle the remorse of conscience after having committed an action which they condemn, or with a view to bring about a state of mind which renders them capable of acting contrary to the dictates of their consciences.

Each of us knows by experience that his state of mind is modified after the absorption of alcohol or of nicotine, and that what he would be ashamed of before imbibing this artificial stimulus would not trouble him afterwards.

Every smoker may, if he chooses, experience the same sharply expressed desire to deaden his intellectual faculties at some critical moment of his life.

To sum up, one cannot but see that the habit of taking stimulants, whether in small or large quantities, periodically or irregularly, both

amongst the higher and the lower classes of society, proves the lulling of their consciences to rest in order to blind them to the flagrant disagreement which exists between modern life and the exigencies of the conscience.

. . . The characteristic property which distinguishes tobacco from other narcotics, in addition to the rapidity with which it deadens the mind, not to mention its pretended innocuousness, is the facility with which it can be carried about and used.

. . . The evil effects produced by opium and haschisch, which we have heard more than once described, are, indeed, terrible. Terrible, too, are the effects of alcohol, which are every day to be observed in the case of inveterate drunkards. But more terrible still, beyond all comparison, as touching society as a whole, are the effects of the moderate absorption of spirits and tobacco.—(*Essay on Alcohol and Tobacco.*) See also, "Why Do Men Stupefy Themselves?"

CHAPTER X

GOVERNMENT

If we continue to live as we are now living, guided in our private lives, as well as in the life of separate States, by the sole desire of welfare for ourselves and for our State, and think to ensure this welfare by violence, as we do now, then it is perfectly evident that inevitably increasing the means of violence of one against the other, and of State against State, we will, first, keep ruling more and more, transferring the major portion of our productiveness to armaments; and, second, by killing in mutual wars the best physically-developed men, we will become more and more degenerate and morally depraved. . . . It is becoming certain, not only to the mind, but also to the consciousness . . . that, by arming one's self more and more against each other and slaughtering each other in war, we, like spiders in a jar, can come to nothing else but the destruction of each other.—(*Bethink Yourselves.*)

"I regard not only the Russian Government, but all governments, as intricate institutions, sanc-

tified by tradition and custom for the purpose of committing by violence and with impunity the most dreadful crimes of murder, robbery, intoxication, stultification, deprivation, exploitation of the people by the wealthy and powerful; and therefore I think that all efforts of those who wish to improve social life should be directed to the liberation of themselves from Governments, whose evil, and above all whose futility, is in our time becoming more and more obvious. This object is, in my opinion, attainable by one, and only by one, unique means — the inner religiously moral perfectioning of separate individuals."

Every coercive Government is in its essence a great and unnecessary evil, and, therefore, the aim both of us Russians and of all men enslaved by Governments should not be to replace one form of Government by another, but to free ourselves from every Government — to abolish it.—("Crisis in Russia"— *London Times,* Mar. 11, 1905.)

If a man, whether slave or slave owner, really wishes to better not *his* position alone, but the position of people in general, he must not himself do those wrong things which enslave him and his brothers.

And in order not to do the evil which produces misery for himself and for his brothers, he should, first of all, neither willingly nor under compulsion

take any part in governmental activity, and should, therefore, be neither a soldier, nor a field-marshal, nor a minister of state, nor a tax collector, nor a witness, nor an alderman, nor a juryman, nor a Governor, nor a member of Parliament, nor in fact hold any office connected with violence. That is one thing.

Secondly, such a man should not voluntarily pay taxes to governments, either directly or indirectly; nor should he accept money collected by taxes, either as salary, or as pension, or as a reward; nor should he make use of governmental institutions, supported by taxes collected by violence from the people. That is the second thing.

Thirdly, a man who desires not to promote his own well-being alone, but to better the position of people in general, should not appeal to government violence for the protection of his own possessions in land or in other things, nor to defend him and his near ones; but should only possess land and all products of his own or other people's toil in so far as others do not claim them from him.

It is quite true that it is difficult for a man of our times to stand aside from all participation in governmental violence. But the fact that not everyone can so arrange his life as not to participate in some degree in governmental violence does not at all show that it is not possible to free

one's self from it more and more.—(*The Slavery Of Our Times,* 171–173.) Slavery results from laws, laws are made by governments, and, therefore, people can be freed from slavery only by the abolition of governments. But how can governments be abolished? All attempts to get rid of governments by violence have hitherto, always and everywhere resulted only in this: that in place of the deposed governments new ones established themselves often more cruel than those they replaced. . . . All attempts to abolish slavery by violence are like extinguishing fire with fire, stopping water with water, or filling up one hole by digging another.

Therefore, the means of escape from slavery, if such means exist, must be found, not in setting up fresh violence, but in abolishing whatever renders governmental violence possible. And the possibility of governmental violences, like every other violence perpetrated by a small number of people upon a larger number, has always depended, and still depends, simply on the fact that the small numbers are armed, while the larger number are unarmed, or that the small number are better armed than the large number.—(*Slavery of Our Times,* 147–9.)

The liberal representatives of the Zemstvo, doctors, advocates, writers, students and a few

thousand disaffected workingmen, torn from the people, who are now fighting in Russia against the government, and calling and regarding themselves as the representatives of the people — have no right to this claim. In the name of the people, these men present to the Government a demand for freedom of the Press, freedom of Conscience, freedom of assembly, for the separation of the Church from the State, for an eight-hour working day, representation and so forth. But ask the people, the great mass, the hundred million of the peasantry, what they think about these demands, and the true people, the peasants, will be at a loss to answer, because these demands for liberty of the Press, liberty of assembly, for the separation of Church and State, even for an eight-hour working day, have no interest for the great mass of the peasantry.

They need nothing of this, they need something else — that which they have been for long expecting and desiring, of which they are incessantly thinking and talking, and about which there is not one single word in all the Liberal petitions and speeches, and which is only incidentally alluded to in the revolutionary socialistic programmes — they expect and desire one thing, the liberation of the land from the law of property, common ownership of the land. When they are

no longer deprived of the land their children will not go to the factories, or if they do they will themselves settle their hours and wages.—(*Crisis in Russia.*)

CHAPTER XI

A GREAT INIQUITY

(This history-making article, dated July, 1905, first appeared in the *London Times* of August 1, 1905. We give the essence of the article verbatim as it appeared in the *Times,* for which it was translated from the Russian by V. Tchertkoff (editor of the *Free Age Press,* Christchurch, Hants, England), and I. F. H. It is expressly declared to be free from copyright.— *Ed.*)

RUSSIA is living through an important time destined to have enormous results. One need only for a time free oneself from the idea which has taken root amongst our intellectuals, that the work now before Russia is the introduction into our country of those same forms of political life which have been introduced into Europe and America, and are supposed to insure the liberty and welfare of all the citizens — and to simply think of what is morally wrong in our life, in order to see quite clearly that the chief evil from which the whole of the Russian people are unceasingly and cruelly suffering cannot be removed by any political reforms, just as it is not up to the present time re-

moved by any of the political reforms of Europe and America. This evil — the fundamental evil from which the Russian people, as well as the peoples of Europe and America, are suffering — is that the majority of the people are deprived of the indisputable natural right of every man to use a portion of the land on which he was born. It is sufficient to understand all the criminality, the sinfulness of the situation in this respect, in order to understand that until this atrocity, continuously committed by the owners of the land, shall cease, no political reforms will give freedom and welfare to the people, but that, on the contrary, only the emancipation of the majority of the people from that land-slavery in which they are now held can render political reforms, not a plaything and a tool for personal aims in the hands of politicians, but the real expression of the will of the people.

The other day I was walking along the high-road to Tula. It was on the Saturday of Holy Week; the people were driving to market in lines of carts, with calves, hens, horses, cows (some of the cows were being conveyed in the carts, so starved were they). A young peasant was leading a sleek, well-fed horse to sell.

"Nice horse," said I.

"Couldn't be better," said he, thinking me a buyer. "Good for plowing and driving."

"Then why do you sell it?"

"I can't use it. I've only two allotments. I can manage them with one horse. I've kept them both over the winter, and I'm sorry enough for it. The cattle have eaten everything up, and we want money to pay the rent."

"From whom do you rent?"

"From Maria Ivanovna; thanks be to her she let us have it. Otherwise it would have been the end of us."

"What are the terms?"

"She fleeces us of fourteen roubles. But where else can we go? So we take it."

A woman passed driving along with a boy wearing a little cap. She knew me, clambered out, and offered me her boy for service. The boy is quite a tiny fellow with quick, intelligent eyes.

"He looks small, but he can do everything," she says.

"But why do you hire out such a little one?"

"Well, sir, at least it'll be one mouth less to feed. I have four besides myself, and only one allotment. God knows, we've nothing to eat. They ask for bread and I've none to give them."

With whomsoever one talks, all complain of

their want and all similarly from one side or another come back to the sole reason. There is insufficient bread, and bread is insufficient because there is no land.

"What is man?" says Henry George in one of his speeches.

"In the first place, he is an animal, a land animal who cannot live without land. All that man produces comes from the land; all productive labor, in the final analysis, consists in working up land, or materials drawn from land, into such forms as fit them for the satisfaction of human wants and desires. Why, man's very body is drawn from the land. Children of the soil, we come from the land, and to the land we must return. Take away from man all that belongs to the land, and what have you but a disembodied spirit? Therefore he who holds the land on which and from which another man must live is that man's master; and the man is his slave. The man who holds the land on which I must live can command me to life or to death just as absolutely as though I were his chattel. Talk about abolishing slavery — we have not abolished slavery; we have only abolished one rude form of it, chattel slavery. There is a deeper and more insidious form, a more cursed form yet before us to abolish, in this industrial slavery that makes a man a virtual slave, while

taunting him and mocking him in the name of freedom.

"Did you ever think (says Henry George in another part of the same speech) of the utter absurdity and strangeness of the fact that all over the civilized world the working classes are the poor classes? Think for a moment how it would strike a rational being who had never been on the earth before, if such an intelligence could come down, and you were to explain to him how we live on earth, how houses and food and clothing and all the many things we need were all produced by work, would he not think that the working people would be the people who lived in the finest houses and had most of everything that work produces? Yet, whether you took him to London or Paris, or New York, or even to Burlington, he would find that those called the working people were the people who lived in the poorest houses."

The same thing, I would add, takes place in a yet greater degree in the country. Idle people live in luxurious palaces, in spacious and fine abodes. The workers live in dark and dirty hovels.

"All this is strange — just think of it. We naturally despise poverty, and it is reasonable that we should. . . . Nature gives to labor, and to labor alone; there must be human work before

any article of wealth can be produced; and in the natural state of things the man who toiled honestly and well would be the rich man, and he who did not work would be poor. We have so reversed the order of nature that we are accustomed to think of the working man as a poor man. . . . The primary cause of this is that we compel those who work to pay others for permission to do so. You may buy a coat, a horse, a house; there you are paying the seller for labor exerted, for something that he has produced, or that he has got from the man who did produce it; but when you pay a man for land, what are you paying him for? You are paying for something that no man has produced; you pay him for something that was here before man was, or for a value that was created, not by him individually, but by the community of which you are a part."

It is for this reason that the one who has seized the land and possesses it is rich, whereas he who cultivates it or works on its products is poor.

"We talk about over-production. How can there be such a thing as over-production while people want? All these things that are said to be over-produced are desired by many people. Why do they not get them? They do not get them because they have not the means to buy them; not that they do not want them. Why have not they

the means to buy them? They earn too little. When the great mass of men have to work for an average of $1.40 a day, it is no wonder that great quantities of goods cannot be sold.

"Now, why is it that men have to work for such low wages? Because if they were to demand higher wages there are plenty of unemployed men ready to step into their places. It is this mass of unemployed men who compel that fierce competition that drives wages down to the point of bare subsistence. Why is it that there are men who cannot get employment? Did you ever think what a strange thing it is that men cannot find employment? Adam had no difficulty in finding employment, neither had Robinson Crusoe; the finding of employment was the last thing that troubled them.

"If men cannot find an employer, why cannot they employ themselves? Simply because they are shut out from the element on which human labor can alone be exerted. Men are compelled to compete with each other for the wages of an employer, because they have been robbed of the natural opportunities of employing themselves; because they cannot find a piece of God's world on which to work without paying some other human creature for the privilege.

"Men pray to the Almighty to relieve poverty.

But poverty comes not from God's laws — it is blasphemy of the worst kind to say that; it comes from man's injustice to his fellows. Supposing the Almighty were to hear the prayer, how could He carry out the request so long as His laws are what they are? Consider, the Almighty gives us nothing of the things that constitute wealth; He merely gives us the raw material, which must be utilized by men to produce wealth. Does He not give us enough of that now? How could He relieve poverty even if He were to give us more? Supposing in answer to these prayers He were to increase the power of the sun, or the virtue of the soil? Supposing He were to make plants more prolific, or animals to produce after their kind more abundantly? Who would get the benefit of it? Take a country where land is completely monopolized, as it is in most of the civilized countries, who would get the benefit of it? Simply the landowners. And even if God in answer to prayer were to send down out of the heavens those things that men require, who would get the benefit?

"In the Old Testament we are told that when the Israelites journeyed through the desert they were hungered, and that God sent manna down out of the heavens. There was enough for all of them, and they all took it and were relieved. But supposing that the desert had been held as private

property, as the soil of Great Britain is held, as the soil even of our new States is being held; suppose that one of the Israelites had a square mile, and another one had 20 square miles, and another one had 100 square miles, and the great majority of the Israelites did not have enough to set the soles of their feet upon which they could call their own — what would become of the manna? What good would it have done to the majority? Not a whit. Though God had sent down manna enough for all, that manna would have been the property of the landholders, they would have employed some of the others perhaps to gather it up into heaps for them, and would have sold it to their hungry brethren. Consider it; this purchase and sale of manna might have gone on until the majority of Israelites had given all they had, even to the clothes off their backs. What then? Then they would not have had anything to buy manna with, and the consequences would have been that while they went hungry the manna would have lain in great heaps, and the landowners would have been complaining of the over-production of manna. There would have been a great harvest of manna and hungry people, just precisely the phenomenon that we see to-day.

"I do not mean to say that even after you had set right this fundamental injustice there would

not be many things to do; but this I do mean to say, that our treatment of land lies at the bottom of all social questions. This I do mean to say, that, do what you please, reform as you may, you never can get rid of widespread poverty so long as the element on which and from which all men must live is made the private property of some men. It is utterly impossible. Reform government; get taxes down to the minimum; build railroads; institute coöperative stores; divide profits, if you choose, between employers and employed — and what will be the result? The result will be that the land will increase in value — that will be the result — that and nothing else. Experience shows this. Do not all improvements simply increase the value of land — the price that some must pay others for the privilege of living?"

The same, I shall add, do we unceasingly see in Russia. All landowners complain of the unprofitableness and expense of their estates, whilst the price of the land is continually rising. It cannot but rise, since the population is increasing and land is a question of life and death for this population.

And therefore, the people surrender everything they can, not only their labor, but even their lives, for the land which is being withheld from them.

There used to be cannibalism and human sacri-

fices; there used to be religious prostitution and the murder of weak children and of girls; there used to be bloody revenge and the slaughter of whole populations, judicial tortures, quarterings, burnings at the stake, the lash; and there have been, within our memory, "running the gauntlet" and slavery, which have also disappeared. But if we have outlived these dreadful customs and institutions, this does not prove that institutions and customs do not exist amongst us which have become as abhorrent to enlightened reason and conscience as those which have in their time been abolished and have become for us only a dreadful remembrance. The way of human perfecting is endless, and at every moment of historical life there are superstitions, deceits, pernicious and evil institutions already outlived by men and belonging to the past; there are others which appear to us in the far mists of the future; and there are some which we are now living through and whose overliving forms the object of our life. Such in our time is capital punishment and all punishment in general. Such is prostitution, such is flesh eating, such is the work of militarism, war, and such is the nearest and most obvious evil, private property in land.

The evil and injustice of private property in land have been pointed out a thousand years ago by the

prophets and sages of old. Later progressive thinkers of Europe have been oftener and oftener pointing it out. With special clearness did the workers of the French Revolution do so. In latter days, owing to the increase of the population and the seizure by the rich of a great quantity of previously free land, also owing to general enlightenment and the spread of humanitarianism, this injustice has become so obvious that not only the progressive, but even the most average people cannot help seeing and feeling it. But men, especially those who profit by the advantages of landed property — the owners themselves, as well as those whose interests are connected with this institution — are so accustomed to this order of things, they have for so long profited by it, have so much depended upon it, that often they themselves do not see its injustice, and they use all possible means to conceal from themselves and others the truth which is disclosing itself more and more clearly, and to crush, extinguish, and distort it, or, if these do not succeed, to hush it up.

But what has happened? Notwithstanding that at the time of their appearance the English writings of Henry George spread very quickly in the Anglo-Saxon world, and did not fail to be appreciated to the full extent of their great merit, it very soon appeared that in England, and even in

Ireland, where the crying injustice of private landed property is particularly manifest, the majority of the most influential educated people, notwithstanding the conclusiveness of Henry George's arguments and the practicability of the remedy he proposes, opposed his teaching. Radical agitators like Parnell, who at first sympathized with George's scheme, very soon shrank from it, regarding political reforms as more important. In England almost all the aristocrats were against it, also, amongst others, the famous Toynbee, Gladstone, and Herbert Spencer — that Spencer who in his " Social Statics " at first most categorically asserted the injustice of landed property, and then, renouncing this view of his, bought up the old editions of his writings in order to eliminate from them all that he had said concerning the injustice of landed property.

The chief weapon against the teaching of Henry George was that which is always used against irrefutable and self-evident truths. This method, which is still being applied in relation to George, was that of hushing up. This hushing up was effected so successfully that a member of the English Parliament, Labouchere, could publicly say, without meeting any refutation, that " he was not such a visionary as Henry George. He did not propose to take the land from the landlords and

rent it out again. What he was in favor of was putting a tax on land values." That is, whilst attributing to George what he could not possibly have said, Labouchere, by way of correcting these imaginary fantasies, suggested that which Henry George did indeed say.

People do not argue with the teaching of George, they simply do not know it. And it is impossible to do otherwise with his teaching, for he who becomes acquainted with it cannot but agree.

Yet, notwithstanding all, the truth that land cannot be an object of property has become so elucidated by the very life of contemporary mankind that in order to continue to retain a way of life in which private landed property is recognized there is only one means — not to think of it, to ignore the truth, and to occupy oneself with other absorbing business. So, indeed, do the men of our time.

Political workers of Europe and America occupy themselves for the welfare of their nations in various matters: tariffs, colonies, income taxes, military and naval budgets, socialistic assemblies, unions, syndicates, the election of presidents, diplomatic connections — by anything save the one thing without which there cannot be any true improvement in the condition of the people — the re-establishment of the infringed right of all men to

use the land. Although in the depth of their souls political workers of the Christian world feel — cannot but feel — that all their activity, the commercial strife with which they are occupied, as well as the military strife in which they put all their energies — can lead to nothing but a general exhaustion of the strength of nations; still they, without looking forward, give themselves up to the demand of the minute, and, as if with the one desire to forget themselves, continue to turn round and round in an enchanted circle out of which there is no issue.

However strange this temporary blindness of the political workers of Europe and America, it can be explained by the fact that in Europe and America people have already gone so far along a wrong road that the majority of their population is already torn from the land (in America it has never lived on the rural land) and lives either in factories or by hired agricultural labor, and desires and demands only one thing — the improvement of its position as hired laborers. It is therefore comprehensible that to the political workers of Europe and America — listening to the demands of the majority — it may seem that the chief means for the improvement of the position of the people consists in tariffs, trusts, and colonies, but to the Russian people in Russia, where the agri-

cultural population composes 80 per cent. of the whole nation, where all this people request only one thing — that opportunity be given them to remain in this state — it would seem it should be clear that for the improvement of the position of the people something else is necessary.

The people of Europe and America are in the position of a man who has gone so far along a road which at first appeared the right one, but which the further he goes the more it removes him from his object, that he is afraid of confessing his mistake. But the Russians are yet standing before the turning of the path and can, according to the wise saying, "ask their way while yet on the road."

If Russian political workers do speak about land abuse, which they for some reason call the "agrarian" question — probably thinking that this silly word will conceal the substance of the matter — they speak of it, not in the sense that private landed property is an evil which should be abolished, but in the sense that it is necessary in some way or other, by various patchings and palliatives, to plaster up, hush up, and pass over this essential, ancient, and cruel, this obvious and crying injustice, which is awaiting its turn for abolition not only in Russia, but in the whole world.

People have driven a herd of cows, on the milk

products of which they are fed, into an enclosure. The cows have eaten up and trampled the forage in the enclosure, they are hungry, they have chewed one another's tails, they low and moan, imploring to be released from the enclosure and set free in the pastures. But the very men who feed themselves on the milk of these cows have set around the enclosure plantations of mint, of plants for dyeing purposes, and of tobacco; they have cultivated flowers, laid out a racecourse, a park, and a lawn tennis ground, and they do not let out the cows lest they spoil these arrangements. But the cows bellow, get thin, and the men begin to be afraid that the cows may cease to yield milk, and they invent various means of improving the condition of these cows. They erect sheds over them, they introduce wet brushes for rubbing the cows, they gild their horns, alter the hour of milking, concern themselves with the housing and treating of invalid and old cows, they invent new and improved methods of milking, they expect that some kind of wonderfully nutritious grass they have sown in the enclosure will grow up, they argue about these and many other varied matters, but they do not, cannot — without disturbing all they have arranged around the enclosure — do the only simple thing necessary for themselves as well as for the cows, take down the

fence and grant the cows their natural freedom of using in plenty the pastures surrounding them.

Acting thus, men act reasonably, but there is an explanation of their action; they are sorry for the fate of all they have arranged around the enclosure. But what shall we call those people who have set nothing around the fence, but who, out of imitation of those who do not set free their cows, owing to what they had arranged around the enclosure, also keep their cows inside the fence, and assert that they do so for the welfare of the cows themselves?

Precisely thus act those Russians, both Governmental and anti-Governmental, who arrange for the Russian people, unceasingly suffering from the want of land, every kind of European institution, forgetting and denying the chief thing: that which alone the Russian people requires — the liberation of the land from private property, the establishment of equal rights on the land for all men.

The true bread-supporters of these European parasites are the laborers they do not see in India, Africa, Australia, and partly in Russia. But it is not so for us Russians; we have no colonies where slaves invisible to ourselves feed us for our manufacturing produce. Our bread-winners, suffering, hungry, are always before our eyes, and we cannot transfer the burden of our iniquitous life to dis-

tant colonies, that slaves invisible to us should feed us. Our sins are always before us.

And behold, instead of entering into the needs of those who support us, instead of hearing their cries and endeavoring to satisfy them, we, instead of this, under pretext of serving them, also prepare, according to the European sample, socialistic organizations for the future, and in the present occupy ourselves with what amuses and distracts us, and appears to be directed to the welfare of the people out of whom we are squeezing their last strength in order to support us, their parasites.

One need only enter into the unceasing sufferings of millions of the people; the dying out from want of the aged, women, and children, and of the workers from excessive work and insufficient food — one need only enter into the servitude, the humiliations, all the useless expenditures of strength, into the deprivations, into all the horror of the needless calamities of the Russian rural population which all proceed from insufficiency of land — in order that it should become quite clear that all such measures as the abolition of censorship, of arbitrary banishment, etc., which are being striven after by the pseudo-defenders of the people, even were they to be realized, would form only the most insignificant drop in the ocean of that want from which the people are suffering.

There was a time when in the name of God and of true faith in Him men were destroyed, tortured, executed, beaten in scores and hundreds of thousands. We, from the height of our attainments, now look down upon the men who did these things.

But we are wrong. Amongst us there are many such people, the difference lies only here — that those men of old did these things then in the name of God, and of His true service, whilst now those who commit the same evil amongst us do so in the name of "the people," "for the true service of the people." And as amongst the former there were men insanely self-convinced that they knew the truth, and there were others, hypocrites, taking up their position under the pretext of serving God, and there was a crowd without consideration following the more dexterous and bold, so also now those who do evil in the name of serving the people consist of men insanely self-convinced that they alone know the truth — of hypocrites and of the crowd. Much evil have the self-proclaimed servants of God done in their time, thanks to the teaching which they called Theology, but the servants of the people, thanks to the teaching which they call Science, if they have done less evil, it is only because they have not yet had time to do it, but already on their conscience there lie rivers of blood

and great divisions and exasperation amongst men.

Of all indispensable alterations of the forms of social life there is in the life of the world one which is most ripe, one without which not a single step forward in improvement in the life of men can be accomplished. The necessity of this alteration is obvious to every man who is free from preconceived theories. This alteration is not the work of Russia alone, but of the whole world. All the calamities of mankind in our time are connected with this condition.

[This is perhaps an example of Tolstoy's general statements; so broad as to seem absurd at first glance. But it is clear that every improvement in the condition of the earth, whether agricultural, mechanical, political, social, ethical, educational or even religious, must go eventually and mainly to the benefit of the owners of the earth. If, then, Tolstoy's idea is correct, that our land system is the root of our economic evils; all the "improvements" which go to make it less hideous, result in the main in strengthening the system.—Ed.]

Without religion one cannot really love men, and without loving men one cannot know what they require, and what is more, and what is less necessary for them. Only those who are not religious, and therefore do not truly love, can invent trifling,

unimportant improvements in the condition of the people without seeing that chief evil from which others are suffering, and which they themselves are partly producing. Only such people can preach more or less cleverly-constructed abstract theories supposed to render the people happy in the future, and not see the sufferings the people are bearing in the present and which demand immediate and practical alleviation. As it were, a man who has deprived a hungry man of his food is giving him his counsel (and that of a very doubtful character) as to how he should get food in the future, without deeming it necessary immediately to share with him that part of his own abundance consisting of the food he has actually taken away from the man.

Fortunately, great beneficial movements in humanity are accomplished not by parasites feeding on the life-blood of the people, whatever they may call themselves — Governments, Revolutionists, or Liberals — but by religious people — that is, by people who are serious, simple, laborious, and who live not for their own profit, vanity, or ambition, and not for the attainment of external results, but for the fulfillment before God of their human vocation.

Such men, and only such, by their noiseless but resolute activity, move mankind forward. Such

men will not, desiring to distinguish themselves in the eyes of others, invent this or that improvement in the condition of the people (there can be an endless number of such improvements, and they are all insignificant if the chief thing is not done), but will endeavor to live in accordance with the law of God, with conscience, and in endeavoring to live so they will naturally come across the most obvious transgression of this law, and for themselves, and for others will search for the means of freeing themselves from it.

"Great social reforms," says Mazzini, "always have been and will be the result of great religious movements."

And such is the religious movement which is now pending for the Russian people, for all the Russian people, for the working classes deprived of land as well as, and especially for, the big, medium, and small landowners, and for all those hundreds of thousands of men who, although they do not directly possess land, yet occupy an advantageous position, thanks to the compulsory labor of the people who are deprived of land.

This sin can be undone, not by political reform, nor socialistic schemes for the future, nor by revolutions in the present, and still less by philanthropic assistance or governmental organization for the purchase and distribution of land among the peas-

ants. Such palliative measures only distract attention from the essence of the problem and thus retard its solution.

No artificial sacrifices are necessary, no concern about the people — there is only necessary the consciousness of this sin by all those who commit or participate in it, and the desire of freeing themselves from it.

It is only necessary that the undeniable truth which the best men of the people always knew and know — that the land cannot be the exclusive property of some, and that the non-admission to the land of those who are in need of it is a sin — that this truth should become generally recognized by all men; that people should become ashamed of retaining the land from those who want to feed themselves from it; that it should become a shame in any way to participate in this retention of the land from those who need it, a shame to possess land, a shame to profit by the labor of men compelled to work only because they have been deprived of their legitimate right to the land.

Possessing hundreds, thousands, scores of thousands of acres, trading in land, profiting one way or the other by landed property, and living luxuriously, thanks to the oppression of the people, possible through this cruel and obvious injustice — to argue in various committees and assemblies about

the improvement of the conditions of the peasant's life without surrendering one's own exclusively advantageous position growing from this injustice, is not only an unkind but a detestable and evil thing, equally condemnable by common sense, honesty and Christianity. It is necessary, not to invent cunning devices for the improvement of men deprived of their lawful right to the land, but to understand one's own sin in relation to them, and before all else to cease to participate in it, whatever this may cost. Only such moral activity of every man can and will contribute to the solution of the question now standing before humanity.

The land question has at the present time reached such a state of ripeness as fifty years ago was reached by the question of serfdom. Exactly the same is being repeated. As at that time men searched for the means of remedying the general uneasiness and dissatisfaction which were felt in society, and applied all kinds of external governmental means, but nothing helped nor could help whilst there remained the ripening and unsolved question of personal slavery, so also now no external measures will help or can help until the ripe question of landed property be solved. As now measures are proposed for adding slices to the peasants' land, for the purchase of land by the aid of banks, etc., so then also palliative measures were

proposed and enacted, material improvements, rules about three days' labor, and so forth. Even as now the owners of land talk about the injustice of putting a stop to their criminal ownership, so then people talked about the unlawfulness of depriving owners of their serfs. As then the Church justified the serf right, so now that which occupies the place of the Church — Science — justifies landed property. Just as then slave owners, realizing their sin more or less, endeavored in various ways without undoing it to mitigate it, and substituted the payment of a ransom by the serfs for direct compulsory work for their masters and moderated their exactions from the peasants, so also now the more sensitive landowners, feeling their guilt, endeavor to redeem it by renting their land to the peasants on more lenient conditions, by selling it through the peasant banks, by arranging schools for the people, ridiculous houses of recreation, magic-lantern lectures and theaters.

The question will be solved, not by those who will endeavor to mitigate the evil or to invent alleviations for the people or to postpone the task of the future, but by those who will understand that, however one may mitigate a wrong, it remains a wrong, and that it is senseless to invent alleviations for a man we are torturing, and that one cannot postpone when people are suffering,

but should immediately take the best way of solving the difficulty and immediately apply it in practice. And the more should it be so that the method of solving the land problem has been elaborated by Henry George to such a degree of perfection that, *under the existing State organization and compulsory taxation,* it is impossible to invent any other better, more just, practical, and peaceful solution.

"To beat down and cover up the truth that I have tried to-night to make clear to you [said Henry George], selfishness will call on ignorance. But it has in it the germinative force of truth, and the times are ripe for it. . . . The ground is plowed; the seed is set; the good tree will grow. So little now; only the eye of faith can see it."

And I think Henry George is right, that the removal of the sin of landed property is near, that the movement called forth by Henry George was the last birth-throe, and that the birth is on the point of taking place; the liberation of men from the sufferings they have so long borne must now be realized. Besides this, I think (and I would like to contribute to this, in however small a measure) that the removal of this great universal sin — a removal which will form an epoch in the history of mankind — is to be effected precisely by the Russian Slavonian people, who are, by their

spiritual and economic character, predestined for this great universal task — that the Russian people should not become proletarians in imitation of the peoples of Europe and America, but, on the contrary, that they should solve the land question at home by the abolition of landed property, and show other nations the way to a rational, free and happy life, outside industrial, factory, or capitalistic coercion and slavery — that in this lies their great historical calling.

CHAPTER XII

HUMAN RIGHTS

(Tolstoy proclaimed the law of love as enunciated by Christ; the political rights as enunciated by Thomas Jefferson; the economic rights as announced by Henry George: the two latter as amplifications of the first; all being essential to man's earthly welfare. Tolstoy's philosophy was progressive. At first he saw that the law of love was necessary; then he recognized the necessity of equal political rights; next he recognized that without economic justice these remedies were futile, and he accordingly embraced the philosophy of Henry George, as evidenced by the following article addressed to the Russian people.— *Ed.*)

A NUMBER of suggestions have been made as to how to divide, in the most just manner, all land among the workers, but of all these only the one made by the late Henry George appears to me to be practicable.

The property right, Henry George wrote in his book about the single tax, is founded not on human laws, but on the laws of God. It is undenia-

ble and absolute, and everyone who violates it, be it an individual or a nation, commits a theft.

A man who catches a fish, who plants a tree, builds a house, constructs a machine, sews a dress or paints a picture, thereby becomes the owner of the results of his own efforts — he has the right to give them away, to sell them or to leave them to his heirs. As the land has not been created by us, and only serves as the temporary residence of changing generations of human beings, it is clear that nobody can own the exclusive right to possess land, and that the rights of all men to it are equal and inalienable.

The right to own land is limited by the equal rights of all others, and this imposes upon the temporary possessor of land the duty to remunerate society for the valuable privilege given him to use the land in his possession.

When we impose a tax upon houses, crops, or money in any form, we take from members of society something which by right belongs to them, we violate the property right and commit a theft in the name of the law; while when we impose a tax upon land we take from members of society something which does not belong to them, but to society, and which cannot be given to them except at a detriment to others. We thus violate the laws of justice when we place a tax on labor or

the results of labor, and we also violate them if we do not levy a tax on land.

Let us, therefore, decide to stop levying all taxes except the tax on the value of land, regardless of the buildings erected or the improvements made on it, but only on the value which natural or social conditions give to it.

If we place this single tax on land the results will be these:

1. The tax will relieve us of the whole army of officials necessary to collect the present taxes, which will diminish the cost of government, at the same time making it more honest. It will rid us of all the taxes which lead to lying, to perjury, to frauds of all kinds. All land is visible, and cannot be hidden, and its value is fixed easier than that of any other property, and the single tax can be determined at less expense and less danger to public morals.

2. It will to a great extent increase the production of wealth, doing away with the discouraging tax upon labor and thrift, and it will make the land more accessible to those who want to work or improve, as the proprietors, who do not work themselves, but speculate in its increasing value, will find it difficult to keep up such expensive property. The tax on labor, on the other hand, leads to the accumulation of immense fortunes in a few

hands, and the increasing poverty of the masses. This unjust division of wealth on one side leads to the creation of one class of people who are idle and corrupt, because they are too rich, and the creation of another class of people who are too poor, and thus doubly delays the production of wealth. This unjust division of wealth creates on one side terrible millionaires, and on the other side vagrants, beggars, thieves, gamblers and social parasites of various kinds, and necessitates an enormous expense for officials to watch these — policemen, judges, prisons and other means which society uses in self-defense.

The single tax is a remedy for all these evils.

I do not mean to say that this tax will transform human nature, for that is not within the power of man, but it will create conditions under which human nature will grow better instead of worse, as under the present conditions. It will make possible an increase of wealth, of which it is hardly possible to form an idea. It will make undeserved poverty impossible. It will do away with the demoralizing struggle for a living. It will make it possible for men to be honest, just, reasonable and noble, if they desire to be so. It will prepare the soil for the coming of the epoch of justice, abundance, peace and happiness, which Christ told His disciples of.

Let us suppose that in a certain place all land belongs to two owners — one very rich, who lives far away, and another, not rich, living and working at home — and to a hundred of small peasants owning a few acres each. Besides these, there live on that place some scores of people who own no land — mechanics, merchants, and officials.

Now let us suppose that the people of that community, having arrived at the conclusion that the land is common property, decide to dispose of the land according to their new conviction.

What would they do? Take all the land away from those who own it, and give everybody the right to take the land he desires? That could not be done, because there would be several people who would want the same ground, and this would lead to endless quarrels. To form one society and work all things in common would be difficult, because some have carts, wagons, horses and cattle, while others have none, and, besides, some people do not know how to till the soil, or are not strong enough.

To divide all the land in equal parts, according to its value, and allow one part to each is very difficult, and this would, besides, be impracticable, because the lazy and poor would lease their property to the rich for money, and these would soon again be in possession of it all.

The inhabitants of the community, therefore, decide to leave the land in the possession of those who own it, and to order each owner to pay into the common treasury money representing the revenue which had been decided on after appraising the value of the land, not according to the work or the improvements made on it, but to its quality and situation, and this money was to be divided equally among all.

But as it was difficult first to take this money from all those who held the land, and then divide it equally among all the members of the community, and as these members, besides, paid money toward the public needs — schools, fire departments, roads, etc.— and as this money was always needed, they decided to use all the money derived from those who had the use of the land, for public needs.

Having made this arrangement, the members of the community levied the tax for the use of land on the two large owners, and also on the small peasants, but no tax at all was imposed on those who held no land.

This caused the one landowner who lived far away, and who derived little income from his property, to realize that it did not pay to hold on to land thus taxed, and he gave it up. The other large owner gave up part of his land, and kept only that part which produced more than the

amount of his tax. Those of the peasants who held small properties, and who had plenty of men, and not enough land, as well as some of those who held no land at all, but who desired to make a living by working the land, took up the land surrendered by its former owners.

After that all the members of the community could live on the land and make a living from it, and all land passed into the hands of or remained with those who loved to work it, and who made it produce the most. The public institutions flourished and the wealth of the community increased, for there was more money than before for public needs; and the most important fact was that this change in the ownership of land took place without any discussions, quarrels, or discord, by the voluntary surrender of the land by those who did not derive any profit from it.

This is the project of Henry George, which, if tried here, would make Russia wealthy and happy, and which is practicable all over the world.

3477 6

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: Dec. 2004

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 013 594 015 A